

6571

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

National Association *of* Elocutionists

**Thirteenth
Annual
Meeting**

Held at NEW
YORK CITY
JUNE 27 TO
JULY 1, 1904

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION

Copyright, 1905, by the
National Association of Elocutionists

PRESS OF FERRIS & LEACH, PHILA.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Address of Welcome:	
Prof. Charles Sprague Smith, New York City	15
Address, President's:	
Henry Gaines Hawn	20
By-Laws	13
Committees, Reports of:	
Section I., Methods of Teaching	107
Section II., Interpretation	108
Necrology	108
Pronunciation	109
Conference with N. E. A.	113
Resolutions	114
Committees, Special, 1903-04	8
Committees, Standing, 1904-05	7
Constitution	9
Constitution, Amendment to	10
Directors, Board of:	
Names of	6
Election of New Members of	116
From the Minutes of, 1905	175
Organization and Minutes of New Board, 1905-06	175
Discussion upon papers delivered during the week	92
Elections	115
Excursion	71
Interpretation, Section II.:	
F. F. Mackay, Chairman	146
"Past Emotion as Present," F. F. Mackay	146
"Inflections," Mrs. Estelle Davis	156
"Pantomime in Interpretation," Mme. Alberti	163
Lecture:	
"Browning's Philosophy of Life," Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, New York City	30
List of Members	178
Methods of Teaching, Section I.:	
Miss Marie Ware Laughton, Chairman	125
"How to Develop the Voice," Miss Laughton	125

	PAGE
"The Training of the Speaking Voice," Miss Cora L. Wheeler	128
"Principles of Vocal Expression," Robert I. Fulton	132
Question Box, Conducted by Robert I. Fulton	138
Nominating Committee:	
Election of	138
Report of	115
Officers	5
Official Organ, "Talent," Paul M. Pearson, Editor	175
Papers:	
"Standards of Criticism in Dramatic Art," Mr. Franklin H. Sargent	30
"Standards of Criticism in Literary Interpretation," Mr. P. M. Pearson	38
"The Use of Visible Speech to the Elocutionist," Mary S. Thompson	55
"Technique in Reader's Art," Dr. Silas S. Neff	60
"Action in Public Address," Mr. John Phillips Silvernail ..	74
Extempore Speech: "Is It a Practical Subject? Can it be Taught?" Mr. J. W. Wetzel	83
Place of Next Meeting, Washington, D. C.	121
President, New, Introduction of	118
Proceedings of Sections:	
Section Work, I, Methods of Teaching	125
Section Work, II, Interpretation	146
Recitals:	
Mrs. Frances Carter	30
Miss Martea Gould Powell	54
Miss Helen Merci Schuster	54
Mr. Fred Emerson Brooks	54
Mr. John Rummell	92
Mrs. Ida Benfey Judd	92
Mrs. William Calvin Chilton	92
Miss Katherine Jewell Everts	122
Mrs. Martha S. Gielow	122
Mrs. Belle Watson Melville	122
Treasurer's Report	177
Voluntary Recitals for Criticism:	
Mrs. Emma Pritchard Hadley	49
Mr. Henry Gaines Hawn	51
Miss Magley	89

OFFICERS.

1904-1905.

ROBERT I. FULTON, PRESIDENT,

Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.

MRS. FRANCES CARTER, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT,

New York City.

MISS MARIE WARE LAUGHTON, SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT,

Pierce Building, Boston, Mass.

R. E. PATTISON KLINE, SECRETARY,

Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kan.

PRESTON K. DILLENBECK, TREASURER,

1012 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.

HENRY GAINES HAWN, CHAIRMAN BOARD OF DIRECTORS,

Carnegie Hall, New York City.

MRS. ELIZABETH R. WALTON,

CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,

2005 G Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

FRANKLIN H. SARGENT, CHAIRMAN OF LITERARY COMMITTEE,

Carnegie Hall, New York City.

F. F. MACKAY, CHAIRMAN BOARD OF TRUSTEES,

233 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City.

DIRECTORS.

TERM EXPIRING 1907.

HENRY GAINES HAWN,	New York City.
MRS. ELIZABETH M. IRVING,	Toledo, O.
F. F. MACKAY,	New York City.
CHANNING RUDD,	Washington, D. C.
JOHN P. SILVERNAIL,	Rochester, N. Y.
JOHN RUMMELL,	Buffalo, N. Y.
MISS CORA M. WHEELER,	Utica, N. Y.

TERM EXPIRING 1906.

MISS LAURA ALDRICH,	Cincinnati, O.
E. M. BOOTH,	Chicago, Ill.
MISS EMMA A. GREELY,	Boston, Mass.
MISS CORA MARSLAND,	Emporia, Kan.
ADRIAN M. NEWENS,	Ames, Iowa.
FRANKLIN H. SARGENT,	New York City.
MRS. ELIZABETH R. WALTON,	Washington, D. C.

TERM EXPIRING 1905.

MISS MIRIAM NELKE,	Provo City, Utah.
EDWARD AMHERST OTT,	Chicago, Ill.
VIRGIL A. PINKLEY,	Cincinnati, O.
MISS MARTEA GOULD POWELL,	Denver, Col.
MRS. HARRIET AUGUSTA PRUNK,	Indianapolis, Ind.
THOMAS C. TRUEBLOOD,	Ann Arbor, Mich.
HANNIBAL A. WILLIAMS,	New York City.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD.

1904-1905.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

Mrs. Elizabeth R. Walton, Chairman,	Washington, D. C.
Henry Gaines Hawn,	New York City.
Mrs. Elizabeth M. Irving,	Toledo, O.
Channing Rudd,	Washington, D. C.
Miss Miriam Nelke,	Provo City, Utah.
John P. Silvernail,	Rochester, N. Y.
Hannibal A. Williams,	New York City.

LITERARY COMMITTEE.

Franklin H. Sargent, Chairman,	New York City.
Miss Laura E. Aldrich,	Cincinnati, O.
Miss Emma A. Greely,	Boston, Mass.
Adrian M. Newens,	Ames, Iowa.
Edward A. Ott,	Chicago, Ill.
Thomas C. Trueblood,	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Miss Cora M. Wheeler,	Utica, N. Y.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

F. F. Mackay, Chairman,	New York City.
E. M. Booth,	Chicago, Ill.
Miss Cora Marsland,	Emporia, Kan.
Virgil A. Pinkley,	Cincinnati, O.
Miss Martea G. Powell,	Denver, Col.
Mrs. Harriet A. Prunk,	Indianapolis, Ind.
John Rummell,	Buffalo, N. Y.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

1903-1904.

SECTION I.—METHODS OF TEACHING.

Miss Marie Ware Laughton, Boston, Mass.
 Miss Caroline B. LeRow, New York City.
 Robert I. Fulton, Delaware, O.

SECTION II.—INTERPRETATION.

F. F. Mackay, New York City.
 Mme. Eva Alberti, New York City.
 Miss Cora Marsland, Emporia, Kan.

CREDENTIALS.

John P. Silvernail, Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
 Mrs. Edna Chaffee Noble, Detroit, Mich.
 Mrs. Elizabeth R. Walton, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION COMMITTEE.

Henry M. Soper, Chicago, Ill.
 Mrs. Emma P. Hadley, Somerville, Mass.
 Miss Cora M. Wheeler, Utica, N. Y.
 Mrs. Elizabeth Mansfield Irving, Toledo, O.
 Mrs. William Calvin Chilton, Oxford, Miss.

RESOLUTIONS.

John P. Silvernail, Rochester, N. Y.
 John Rummell, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Miss Cora M. Wheeler, Utica, N. Y.

CONFERENCE WITH N. E. A.

Thomas C. Trueblood, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Miss Laura Aldrich, Cincinnati, O.
 Miss Marie L. Bruot, Cleveland, O.

NECROLOGY.

Robert I. Fulton, Delaware, O.
 Mrs. Ida M. Moore, St. Louis, Mo.
 Mrs. Elizabeth R. Walton, Washington, D. C.

PRONUNCIATION.

Franklin H. Sargent, New York City.
 Miss Anna Warren Story, New York City.
 Miss Marie Ware Laughton, Boston, Mass.

Constitution

ARTICLE I.—NAME.

This body shall be called the National Association of Elocutionists.

ARTICLE II.—OBJECT.

To promote vocal culture and dramatic expression, and to unite the members of the fraternity of readers and teachers of elocution and oratory in closer professional and personal relationship, by means of correspondence, conventions, and exchange of publications.

ARTICLE III.—MEMBERSHIP.

(Adopted July 2, 1897.)

SECTION 1. *Active Membership*.—Any teacher of oratory, elocution, dramatic expression, or voice culture for speech, or any author of works upon these subjects, any public reader, public speaker or professional actor shall be eligible to Active Membership. But every applicant for Active Membership shall have a general education equivalent to graduation from an English high school, and, in addition, shall be graduated from some recognized school of elocution, oratory, expression or dramatic art, or shall have had the equivalent training in private under a teacher of recognized ability; and, furthermore, shall have had at least two years of professional experience as artist or teacher subsequent to graduation or the completion of the equivalent private course.

SEC. 2. *Associate Membership*.—All persons not eligible to Active Membership (including students of subjects named in Section 1) shall be eligible to Associate Membership. Associate members shall not be entitled to vote or

hold office, but shall enjoy all other privileges of membership.

SEC. 3. *Honorary Membership.*—Persons of eminence in the profession, or such as may have rendered conspicuous service to the Association, may be elected to Honorary Membership.

SEC. 4. *Membership Fee.*—The fee for Active or Associate Membership in the Association shall be \$3 for the first year, payable on application for membership, and \$2 for each succeeding year. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall entail loss of membership in the Association.

(Amendment Adopted July 1, 1904.)

Active members who entail loss of membership by non-payment of dues shall not be re-instated nor re-elected to membership until after payment in full of all arrears, this ruling to be operative after the first meeting of the Board at the 1905 Convention.

SEC. 5. *Election.*—Election, except in the case of Honorary Membership, shall be by the Board of Directors, upon recommendation by the Committee on Credentials. Honorary Members shall be elected by the whole body.

SEC. 6. *Credentials.*—The Board of Directors of the Association shall elect from their number a Committee on Credentials, who shall determine the fitness of all applicants for admission. The first committee shall consist of three members, elected for one, two and three years respectively. The vacancy occurring each year shall be filled at each annual meeting by the election of a member for the full term of three years. In case of the inability of any member to serve out the term for which he was elected, the Board of Directors shall also elect a member for the unexpired portion thereof. The Committee on Credentials shall publish in the official organ of the Association from time to time a list of applicants recommended by them for membership, and shall post a complete list of the same in some conspicuous part of the hall of meeting, at least twelve hours preceding the opening of the convention. Applications received later than the Saturday preceding the convention shall be referred to subsequent meetings of the Board of Directors; but in no case shall an applicant be

elected without twelve hours' notice of his recommendation by posting the same. Any member having a valid objection to the admission of an applicant so posted shall have the privilege of a hearing thereupon, before the Committee on Credentials. Pending election, the Committee on Credentials may instruct the doorkeeper to admit all applicants upon presentation of the Treasurer's receipt for membership dues.

SEC. 7. *Appeal*.—Appeal from the action of the Committee on Credentials may be made to the Board of Directors, but from the action of the Board there can be no appeal.

ARTICLE IV.—OFFICERS.

There shall be annually chosen a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and a Treasurer, whose duties shall be those ordinarily devolving upon such officers. There shall also be a Board of twenty-one Directors divided into three classes: Committee of Ways and Means, Literary Committee, and Board of Trustees. The seven persons receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected for three years, the seven receiving the next highest number shall be elected for two years, and the next seven for one year. The officers first named shall be ex-officio members of the Board of Directors.

Seven Directors shall be elected annually to fill places of the seven retiring.

ARTICLE V.—MEETINGS.

The annual meeting of the Association shall be held at such time and place as the Directors may suggest and the Association determine.

ARTICLE VI.—SECTIONS.

The Association may, during the year, organize itself into sections, each appointing its own chairman, and each being responsible for papers and reports in its special departments of study, which documents shall be forwarded to the Directors.

ARTICLE VII.—ALTERATIONS.

Alterations of this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of the members present, at any annual meeting, provided that three months' notice of the same shall be given to the Directors in writing.

ARTICLE VIII.—NOTICE OF ALTERATION.

Any and all notices of alterations of, and amendments to, the Constitution, duly announced in *Werner's Magazine* during the year, shall be deemed lawful notice to each and every member of the Association; said alteration or amendment shall be open to discussion and acceptance or rejection at the coming convention, as provided in Article VII. of the Constitution. Such notification shall be duly signed by the Chairman and Board of Directors.

By-Laws

1. *Rules of Order.*—Rules of order shall be those governing all deliberative assemblies, Roberts's "Rules of Order" being the standard of authority in cases of doubt.

2. *Quorum.*—Seven shall constitute a quorum in the Board of Directors. A quorum of the Association for business purposes shall consist of thirty-five members.

3. *Elections.*—New members shall be passed upon by the Committee and elected by the Board of Directors. Not more than three honorary members shall be elected in one year.

4. *Committees.*—The Committee on Ways and Means shall consider and report to the Directors the time, place and arrangements for each annual meeting, subject to the approval of the Association. The Literary Committee shall be responsible for the literary, scientific and artistic features of the annual meeting, and shall report the same to the Board. The Trustees shall have control of the property of the Association, books, manuscripts, or works of art. They shall be responsible for the custody of revenue of the Association, whether from donations, bequests, members' fees, investments, or from other sources.

5. *Absent Members.*—Members detained from attending the annual meeting shall notify the Secretary.

6. *Papers.*—No paper shall be read before the Convention of the National Association of Elocutionists, except by the author of the same, and no essay shall be published in the official report of the Association, except such as has been read by the author at the Convention, the proceedings of which constitute the report of said Convention. But this by-law shall not be construed so as to prevent the reading and publishing of the essay of any distinguished scientist or litterateur who may be invited by the Literary Commit-

tee to prepare an essay for the Association. The Literary Committee shall be accountable to the Board of Directors for all such invitations.

7. *Advertising.*—No person, whether a member of the Association or not, shall be allowed to advertise in any manner in the rooms of the Convention, any publication, composition, device, school or invention of any sort, whether by free distribution, by circulars, or orally.

8. *Modification or Suspension of By-Laws.*—The above provision shall be modified or suspended only by a two-thirds vote at regular meetings.

The National Association of Elocutionists

The Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Elocutionists was held in the Assembly Hall of the Board of Education, New York City, June 27th to July 1st, 1904.

The first session of the main body was called to order at 2.30 p.m., Monday, June 27th, 1904, by the President, Henry Gaines Hawn.

Prayer

The proceedings were opened with an invocation by the Rev. Thomas J. Crosby, rector of St. James' P. E. Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

MR. HAWN: I have the pleasure of presenting to you, and commending to your attention, Professor Charles Sprague Smith, Managing Director of the People's Institute, who will give us an address of welcome.

Address of Welcome on Behalf of the City of New York

PROFESSOR CHARLES SPRAGUE SMITH, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. President:—When I first received the invitation from my friend, Mr. Franklin H. Sargent, to address your Association of teachers of elocution, I asked myself why he had considered me as especially competent to welcome you to this city. The first suggestion, by way of explanation, was that the foolishness of friendship had been the

motive; but, on further consideration, I recalled that he was aware of the fact that I had charge of a hall where men in public life, supposed to be eloquent, come to test their eloquence in practice, and that thus a natural relation of affinity in pursuits connected us. To speak colloquially, you might be said to be the trainers for the forensic contests, and I the master of the games.

But, whatever may have been the reason that impelled my friend, and thus permitted me to be the one who should bid you welcome, I do give you, in behalf of this city, a most hearty welcome.

It is fortunate that your session did not fall within the last two days. You might have considered that the warmth of your welcome was measured in degrees of Fahrenheit. Indeed, we are ambitious in many ways in this city. We dig deep down into the bowels of the earth to lay the foundations of our immense structures, and then rear them aloft, story on story, until they really merit the name they receive, "sky-scrapers"; and so, in the matter of temperature, or rather of the zones of the earth, we have the ambition to possess all the zones, from the extreme frigid to the extreme torrid, and not only to possess them, but sometimes, through a single twenty-four hours, to distribute samples of all of them. However, Mother Nature has been considerate, and, in view of your coming, has tempered not only for you, but also for all the citizens of New York, the rigor of her heat, and thus the warmth of our welcome may not be considered to be ironically illustrated by the thermometer.

But, to turn aside from lighter considerations, the question is often raised to-day whether in reality there is place, or at least large place, and influence longer for oratory. Some would claim that, in the multiplication of books, and especially of periodical literature, men do not feel any longer the impulse to come together and receive information or argument upon questions of the day, as was the case when the means of disseminating knowledge and conveying argument were less large than at present.

We think of the old Athenian days, when the multitude gathered about the Bema to listen to the great orators, whose fame is to-day a part of the immortality of Greece; or of those gatherings in the Roman Forum, when the brothers Gracchi, or Cicero and his rival, Hortensius, held

spellbound the Roman people. Or, even of more recent days, when the great American tribunes, a Webster and Everett, inspired through their eloquence legislative assemblies or gatherings of the people.

It is, in a measure, true that the large place held by oratory in earlier days is now divided between it and other factors potential in framing our public life. But it would be a superficial judgment to declare that the opportunity of the orator has passed away. We have but to remember the young Nebraskan, who, with a single burst of eloquence,—one might even affirm with a single eloquent phrase,—made himself leader of a great party during two national campaigns. Or, to turn to a nearer example. We have with us a strenuous, rugged District Attorney, who is both much criticised and much admired. His rude style of eloquence, in which directness and sincerity are the predominating characteristics, made him distinctly the magnet of attraction in two civic campaigns.

And, if we turn to other countries, when has England ever lacked in orators? Two names associated in a recent biography suggest themselves at once, John Morley and William Ewart Gladstone; in Germany, the great Socialist leader, Bebel, among others; in France, Gambetta at the birth-time of the last French Republic, and Juarez to-day.

So we might name a multitude, whose influence depends largely upon those various gifts that are summed up in the one word "oratory."

But what is the truth with regard to this statement? Certainly there has been a change. That kind of oratory which the ancients admired, which even our fathers honored, is not that which pre-eminently appeals to us to-day. Yet this assertion would not be universally true, for the style which, when exaggerated, may be called the flamboyant, is still held in honor in certain parts of our country,—and thereby hangs a tale.

Now, I am not consciously persuaded that I was right, and my fellow-judges wrong, because I was in a minority of one. I remember the caution a friend once gave me. "Do not always believe, because you are in a minority of one, that you are therefore in the right."

The reasons for my conviction are, that, as I said in the beginning, I am so placed as to be able to observe many

times every week the kind of oratory that wins a hearing and carries conviction, and that which fails.

The qualities needed for successful oratory to-day are, first, Sincerity. The bell must give a clear sound. The hearer must be persuaded in his inmost soul that the speaker is not declaiming, but interpreting his deepest convictions.

Second, Clarity. There must be no confusion in the interpretation of the thought. The Browning style may have its place in poetry, but certainly not on the platform.

Third, Simplicity. Adornment rather weakens and distracts attention, and should be used with extreme caution.

Fourth, Directness. The speaker must hold constantly his subject in mind, and the plan of his argument, and not allow anything to turn him aside therefrom, unless he be one of those happily-gifted mortals who can turn to wit and humor at intervals, and thus relieve the strain of attention, and make it fresher when he takes up the thread of his argument again.

Fifth, he must talk *with* his audience, not at them. In other words, the oration must savor of the character of conversation, rather than of harangue. Men are impatient of being talked down to.

Sixth, the Gesture should be a natural expression of the Thought. Here we could learn much from those nations of Europe, especially the Southern nations, to whom speech and gesture come twin-born. The old system taught us, in the schools of my day at least, whereby a distinct gesture always accompanied a distinct phase of thought or feeling, is erroneous. The mind should choose and fashion the gesture in freedom, as it chooses and fashions the phrase. We might sum up the whole matter by saying that the outer, the expression, whether in word or in gesture, should be in entire harmony with the inner, the thought and the sentiment. The whole should be as a perfectly-attuned instrument, across whose strings a master hand passes.

There is another thought I would bring to you, whom I will venture now to call my fellow-workers; that is, that there is a clime, a condition, fitted to the development of oratory, and contrariwise. The great orators of the past flourished in the ages of democracy. I have been reading recently one of Demosthenes' superb orations, wherein

Athenian democracy marshals its glorious achievements of the past, and holds them up as an example to the present tending to decadence.

The great orators of Rome belonged to the days of the republic, not to those of the Cæsars. And to-day we should look for oratory, not to autocratically-governed Russia, but to Europe, nominally monarchic, but tending evermore to democracy, and to free America.

You will find in Switzerland, in the meadows, the yellow crocus abloom; and, as you climb higher, other flowers suited to the several altitudes, until amidst the snow of the glaciers, you find the edelweiss and the Alpine rose. So oratory has its habitat, where the air is strong and clear, and whence one may look forth with unconfined vision. And, not only is it true that democracy is the true clime for oratory, but that the age upon which we are now entering in America is the one adapted peculiarly to oratory.

I know not how favorably you are situated for observing the trend of the times, but to all it must be becoming more or less clear that a struggle is impending between monopoly and democracy. Those into whose hands vast power has come through concentration of wealth are, in a sense, the slaves of their own past. They are compelled, if they would safeguard what they have already secured, to extend evermore their control, and the vice of the situation and the danger are not alone in the vast concentration of power in a few hands, but in the methods employed by these few in safeguarding and extending their power.

In other words, corruption is rife among us, and is poisoning our very life blood. No one can have read the recent series of articles by Lincoln Steffens in *McClure's Magazine* without feeling that the time has come to call a halt, to summon together the honest patriots, and resolutely attempt the redemption of democracy.

Within the next twenty-five or fifty years it is probable that the impending struggle between monopoly and democracy will have reached an acute stage.

Democracy cannot be redeemed by the masses unaided. I do not believe that the masses, as masses, are ever capable of this achievement. They must have leaders, and those leaders should be orators possessed of all those qualities I have described. I can conceive of no grander career for the young man of intelligence and consecration, just coming to

manhood to-day, than to equip himself for such a career, to become a guide of the people, out of the confusion and danger of the present, into the large possibilities of the future. For we are not to achieve and perfect democracy for ourselves alone, but for the world. We are a great experiment station, and the world is looking on. The ages gone, through their seers, have proclaimed democracy, the government of, by and for the people, as attainable and *to be*, in some future time. It is for us to translate that future into present, and by our example, stimulate to following and fellowship the other nations of the world.

So that to you, teachers of elocution, comes, as to the Greek trainers of old, for the athletic contests, a distinct work. The Greek trainer prepared his champion with exceeding care, and shared in the exhilaration of the running, and in the joy of the prize won; and so you who are to prepare your champions for a nobler running and a higher prize, may share, by anticipation, in all that your pupils shall accomplish.

So, in conclusion, I would say, let us each return to his station, more willing to contribute his part toward the achievement of American democracy.

President's Address

HENRY GAINES HAWN, NEW YORK CITY.

Ladies and Gentlemen:—I see that the chairman of the Literary Committee has announced me as follows: "President's Message." I am not sure whether the gentleman thought that I could not deliver an address, or that I did have a message; I hope the latter.

I claim to have a message—a message which I want to deliver in all love, in all kindness, in all reverence toward the work we have in hand, and yet a message, I am sure, which will hurt,—not those who are here, merely the absentees.

I am known to be an iconoclast, but I hope such an iconoclast that I realize it is my duty and privilege to suggest other deities for those which I attempt to destroy.

Despite what Professor Smith says, I am going to talk to you, and *at* you, and of course I have the advantage over you, in that you cannot reply.

I believe the world at large learns through direct dogmatic teaching by those who have strong convictions, and I claim to have a strong conviction, and shall deliver it to you as best I may. A witty Frenchman says: "A man who repeats a statement often enough will gain credence, even from himself."

Only a day or so ago I was re-reading that excellent old novel, "The First Violin." While reading, I came across these words: "I have never been angry with the anger that resents. I have known *art anger*, anger at bad work, at false interpretations, at charlatanry in art."

And so there is a new term for my attitude in this address. And surely no personal affront can be given by a man who is willing to confess to the faults which he attacks, being committed by himself in the past. And so it is "*art anger*" which I want to express to you to-day.

I shall be sorry to offend any present, but I am frank to confess that the dignity of my profession, of my art, is of more moment to me than even your personal resentment. And so I am here to say some hard truths as I see them.

I am naturally consumed with art anger, to begin with, by the lack of serious appraisal accorded to this work of ours, and I hold this body still largely responsible for that poor appraisal.

Only recently Dr. Judson, of Chicago, delivered a very able address upon the "Decline of Oratory," and a prominent newspaper of New York City, the *New York Times*, I think, in commenting upon it, said that the learned gentleman had done us good service, but only half service, because he had left the art just where he found it, and had made no suggestions in the way of remedies. And so, after my fault-finding, I hope to suggest a remedy.

As one indication of the cheapness which attaches itself to the art throughout the country, let us notice the vulgar and flagrant advertisements which obtain so largely in the ranks of our profession, some of which I quote:

One is, "None Better"; another, "Always Busy!" another, "The Greatest Ever." One of the most artistic men in our ranks,—a man who does admirable work,—allows his managers to advertise him as "The Standard." I call that

a personal and professional impertinence. Another, "The Most Successful Reader before the Public." Another one advertises that he "has lead every advance in the spoken word for the last twenty-five years." Another: "Why go Elsewhere, when you can come to the Fountain Head?" Another one: "Best Exponents of the Art in America."

Now, you will find the most dignified exponents of no other art advertised in this clap-trap manner. It is my delight to have looked through the advertising mediums of the music world, and to have found simple and dignified announcements, such as "Madam X., late with the Hendrick Opera Company"; "Mr. Jones, Barytone." No comment, no circus-like "blow hard."

Surely we cannot afford for a moment to admit that the art of music is on a higher plane than this art of interpretation.

It has become quite the thing, as you know, for the best dramatic artists to have their announcements made as follows: "Mr. Charles Frohman presents Miss Maud Adams."

Despite this admirable example, *Talent* and *The Lyceumite*, the only magazines we have to represent us, fill their pages with these undignified advertisements, inserted by members of our profession.

The remedy? Don't! Don't advertise yourself and your work in an absurd, pompous, flagrant and vulgar manner.

There are men and women by the hundreds, throughout the country who make their daily bread by teaching this art, and by exploiting it before the public, mostly in a dignified way, but who actually deny the fact that they are elocutionists. There are members of this Association who have inserted in their circulars and programs words like these: "Not a mere Elocutionist."

A lady prominent on both continents, and well established as an interpreter of literature,—as an elocutionist,—was approached in a most courteous and cordial way by those having this convention in charge and asked to appear upon one of our programs. Her husband replied as follows: "Mrs. X. is not in town, and is of course unable to accept the flattering invitation to read before the cheap Jacks and dear Jacks of the National Association of Elocutionists. But strictly, between ourselves, if you would make the lady angry, call her an 'elocutionist.' She doesn't

claim to be one, and never teaches it. Her methods are quite different."

Our ranks are crowded with people who are doing this work, and they all "do it quite differently." Upon close investigation, I am unable to see where they get their difference.

I could take you to men and women in this city who have a good following, who, by the most primitive and imitative methods, coach people to take part in amateur theatricals, recite "parlor pieces," etc., and who claim that they do not teach elocution, but teach something else much better.

This denying of our own work has brought about a most peculiar condition, and that is, people frequently seek our services, and really want them, but always with the proviso: "I do not want to study elocution." There are men and women in our public schools, some of whom I have approached personally, in the vain attempt to interest them in this convention, who say, frankly: "I do not teach elocution." These men and women are supposed to be teaching every-day English speech; they may sometimes go so far as to admit that they are attempting to teach oratory; but please notice that, when the commencement times roll around, and their pupils get up to say their "prize speeches," the poor audience is not afflicted with "elocution." I have attended no less than seven school commencements during the last three weeks. In none did I hear a single student use approximately good English. What I mean by that is not correct grammatical construction, but the normal ordinary tones of the human voice; and as for phonetics, in one school I heard Washington pronounced "Woshington," "Wurshington" and "Wasshington"; in another America was pronounced "Amurika." In every case the instructor would disclaim the teaching of this art, evidently attempting to teach it without knowing anything about its fundamental principles.

I saw a bright lad in a prize speaking contest in a public school of Brooklyn, having in imagination stabbed himself, fall full length upon the floor. The boy was sent to me by his father, who said: "I am not satisfied with what the boy is getting in the public schools;" and yet the teacher of that boy says: "I have the best reputation as a teacher of this art in America, and I cannot afford to risk it by at-

tending the National Association of Elocutionists." He could not afford to "risk it"!

Another public school teacher of this art, in coaching a pupil to recite "As the Moon Rose," in using the words, "She spreads a witchcraft over the boy," insisted upon his making the gesture "she spreads" (illustrating). I said to the student: "It does not mean that, you know; it does not mean spreading bread and butter. It does not mean to spread in that sense; it is a spiritual thing, the casting of a spell over the mind."

Now, these are the people who need just the work we do in this Association, and yet they deny the fact that they are teaching this art at all.

The remedy? Simple honesty.

One other thought. As to the matter of cheap advertising, I would ask the ladies to be a little more sparing of their photographs, in their use of them on their circulars. There is a cheapness about this form of advertising which you cannot possibly deny. You know a great many good-looking people take very wretched pictures. The cheap circular, with the lady advertising her features upon it, is not attractive, and never artistic. To the men I would say, avoid it; but the women are the greater offenders in this respect. Again, do not have your pictures taken in character attitudes and costumes. The attitudes taken in mimicry, for a fleeting moment, in the way of comedy, may be very good, even legitimate; but, when made permanent by the camera, it stamps the buffoon.

These are distressing matters, and they utterly lack dignity. So far I have suggested a remedy for these cheap features in our art by simply using the little word "Don't." It is so easy "not to."

The dramatic profession picks up its skirts, steps aside, and gives us a wide berth. Why? I have been unable to see that the best actor is anything more than an elocutionist plus a costume. Sometimes—often—the costume is good, and generally the elocution is poor.

A great dramatic critic, in New York City this last winter, in speaking of a notable production of "Hamlet," said: "If the principal characters had only gone to some common-sense elocutionist or teacher of English, and had learned how to deliver the words as words, and the thoughts as thoughts, the performance would have been admirable."

Why, then, are we not accepted as worthy teachers and interpreters of the best in dramatic literature? May it not be because we are not worthy? Then let us make ourselves so by earnest and conscientious work.

Please avoid high-sounding, ridiculous terms, as being descriptive of the work you are doing individually. The words "Dialecticians" and "Dialectors" are both rather high-sounding terms for very harmless, inoffensive people.

Now, when I have finished scolding to-day I am sure you will admit that I have done it with good grace, because all of these offenses I have myself committed. For instance, in the coaching of amateur plays, we should not claim educational valuation. I frankly say that is only pastime; it is play mostly; there is no scholarship in it. We cannot expect this work to stand for anything in the educational world; and why contend for it? Our contention becomes merely pretension. "Don't!"

I ask you to recognize once and for all that there is nothing in the securing of cheap newspaper notoriety. We have never made the world take us as serious people, because we do so many non-serious things ourselves. I am told that in every newspaper office in the country, when an amateur production is given, the reporter is sent out with the express command: "Deal gently with it." The same thing obtains, more or less, in the notices which we get from the public press—if any. I have had the most dignified newspaper, perhaps, in this town, the *New York Sun*, send a reporter to me while giving a reading before the Salmagundi Club, and the reporter, even before my recital, pushed a paper over to me, saying: "Write what you want to say about yourself."

There are magazines and papers, monthly, weekly and daily, which will, for so much money paid down, agree, once a week or once a month, to give you so much "write up" in their publications, which "write up" you yourself supply, so you can say just what you please about yourself and your work. We take those cheaply-gotten-up, insincere notices, and print them on our circulars and programs. Any man with a friend at court can get into the best journals in America with fulsome notice. But what is this but a certain indication that we have no professional standing? Shall we submit to this always? I say no. Now, frankly, I tell you that there is no reputable lyceum agent in the

country who cares "that" for your newspaper comments, and the public, too, has learned their worthlessness. Again apply that little word "Don't."

I wish just here to whisper a word in the ear of the clergy, as to the ease with which "anybody" can get an endorsement for "anything" from them. It seems that most of them will give letters of endorsement to any man or woman who applies to them for a critical opinion upon any kind of art work. Who makes them mentors of things artistic? Yet these flippant and vacant letters from the "unknowing" reverend gentlemen are spread broadcast throughout the country, on our advertising circulars and programs. Please "Don't."

Now, despite all that I have said about the existing conditions, the demand for this work was never greater. It is coming slowly above the horizon, only, not to be known as "Elocution," unless we so make it known.

Now, it is solely at our door that the charge of allowing this low appraisal of our work is to be laid. We have over-emphasized one form of the work, the "saying of pieces." We have made it seem that the art of elocution is simply the memorizing of selections, and getting up before the unoffending public, and reciting at them and for them.

Any man or woman who takes a pupil in this art, and attempts, or pretends, to be training him for the public reader's career, is not—how shall I put it?—is not kindly disposed towards his fellow-beings, because there is no career in which the emoluments are so infrequent, so uncertain, and so small.

Half a dozen of my own pupils are still trying, as they have been doing for years, to get what they call "recognition"; and, to get this "recognition," will hesitate at no humiliation, so as to be heard. In my own experience of twenty years, I do not believe that over one in one hundred of my own students could ever be fitted for the career of a dramatic reader. They are lacking, physically and spiritually, in the dramatic temperament. By dramatic temperament I mean the possession of that nervous organization which responds quickly to joy, sorrow, or to the feelings and sensations of life. I could not wish my bitterest enemy the curse of being possessed of the artistic and sensitive temperament; but, without it by birth, no teaching can make the dramatic reader.

The mere memorizing of hundreds of poems, and the doing of all sorts of "stunts," will not make you a capable, dignified, professional, money-earning elocutionist. In other words, our great field of endeavor must ever be with those who come and want to learn the art, and say: "I do not want to learn to recite; I do not care to say pieces."

At least once a week, in this city of New York, you will find some dignified journal discussing the need of this art, yet not so much as naming the remedy. The *New York Times Review* is famous for complaining about the lack of good English speaking and reading, yet it never suggests a remedy. No one seems to realize—among these writers, I mean—that speech is the one function of the human which must be taught from the outside, and must be taught with full consciousness and by the capable elocutionist.

A great many of our teachers of elocution have their work in the college catalogues announced as "Public Speaking," and by so doing militate against themselves, for the art has reference to so much more than public utterance. They wonder why their classes are small. How many students in a college, do you suppose, will have the foresight to look ahead and say: "Upon some occasion, twenty years hence, I may be called upon to get up and make a public, after-dinner speech of ten minutes, and for this I had best prepare by years of study."

Why should the surveyor, the engineer, the man of business, devote time to an art seemingly having no connection with his career? Public-speaking, forsooth! Does our art mean only this? Is not all human thought, all aspiration, imbedded in language? Is not the reading of all literature an elocutionary process, whether read aloud or in imagined tone? But there are those whose whole career is a matter of public speech, yet who never study—*speech*. Students in our theological seminaries leave the art of delivery almost entirely to chance. "Any old way" is good enough in which to speak.

I once made the sensational statement that most of the clergy of the day could be fittingly accused of "obtaining money under false pretenses." When asked how, I replied that their pastoral duties, the heart services they give their congregations, are beyond price, but that the one thing for which they draw their salaries is elocution, and in this they do not give "value received."

Whether marrying the living, or burying the dead, or reading the Scriptures, or preaching sermons, or praying, their office is purely elocutionary.

There have lately been three or four communications written to our great New York dailies, suggesting that perhaps the poor church attendance so noticeable is largely due to the poor elocution from the pulpit. I will make this assertion: I have never known a man who was a gifted, a trained speaker who could not fill his church.

Public speech, therefore, is one manifestation of our art, a recognized need in elocution; but, when all is said, the best outcome of the art is not speech in any form, and we cannot expect the serious notice of the educational world until we teach the connection which our art has with all education, all literature, all life.

The world believes that we deal merely in externals. Let us prove that we deal with the soul of things, with the "inmost center."

Please turn to your programs, on the second page, beginning, "To promote vocal culture," etc. Read a few lines in silence; do you not find that the brain pronounces, uses inflection, makes certain pauses, and uses every other element of the art of vocal reading? In other words, even correct inaudible reading is dependent upon knowing the laws of spoken discourse—Elocution.

"If we think of it, all that the university or final highest school can do for us is still but what the first school began doing, teach us to read." That does not mean, necessarily, to read aloud, or with tone, but to read or interpret to one's self.

Canon Fleming says:

"Our mother tongue ought to have in education a pre-eminence which hitherto has certainly been denied it, for it is in that tongue we have to think, to speak, to read, to write."

Notice, he says, "in that tongue we have to think."

Here is another pertinent quotation:

"Language, I say, is the supreme art of arts, through which all arts, all work, all thought, find form and life, development and use; through which knowledge is not only preserved, and transmitted, and increased, but even originally conceived,—an art, in brief, without which no other art, or science, or knowledge, could exist."

Morley has said:

"Literature is, of all things on earth, the most magnificent."

Matthew Arnold, of course, as you know, calls it the "criticism of life."

Henry van Dyke has this to say:

"Literature exists for the sake of the people, to cheer the weary, to console the sad, to hearten up the dull and downcast, to increase man's interest in the world, his joy of living, and his sympathy with all sorts and conditions of men."

It is with these thoughts in mind that I ask you to help me by speech, thought and writing, by self-culture, and by earnest study, to lift up our art to its proper estimation. And just here let me say that an expert of English, in New York, says that he read two of our annual reports, and there were only two persons who used perfect English. Your president was not one of them.

This is not discouraging. On the contrary, it means to me—as I am sure it does to you—more earnest study, greater personal development.

As a final word I say to you, our work will prosper; we shall gain recognition, when we show that elocution is more than cheap entertainment, the mere reciting of pieces. Teach your selections, not as an end in themselves, but as a means to an end. Prove that Elocution is Education, and you will receive intelligent and ready approval.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for listening so attentively this hot afternoon.

Monday Evening, 8 o'clock

Lecture. "Browning's Philosophy of Life."

REV. THOMAS R. SLICER, New York City.

Music. (a) "My Lovely Celia," old English air.

(b) "Loch Lomond," Scottish air.

(c) "Now is My Chloris," Elizabethan lyric.

WHITNEY MOCKRIDGE.

MRS. WHITNEY MOCKRIDGE, Accompanist.

Reading. "A Blot in the 'Scutcheon,'" Browning.

MRS. FRANCES CARTER, New York City.

Session of the Main Body

Tuesday, June 28th, 1904, 9 a.m.

PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR.

STANDARDS OF CRITICISM IN DRAMATIC ART.

MR. FRANKLIN H. SARGENT, NEW YORK CITY.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I feel very much like a little boy at the seashore, picking up pebbles and showing them to his friends. Anything I may say must be very general and necessarily incomplete. I feel unequal to the part of Atlas. The subject is simply enormous; too much for a single human being to carry in twenty minutes.

The situation reminds me of a play of Molière entitled "Tartuffe," where the valet masqueraded as the master and found himself in a very pleasant position with ladies of wit and culture on either side of him, ready to listen with great

respect and interest as he began by stating that he had "composed Roman history as a madrigal!"

So I am asked to compass dramatic criticism in a twenty-minute sketch, to make an "Elocutionary" holiday—an impossible undertaking.

I recall an incident which occurred some years ago, which seems to be illustrative. A young man, at that time unknown, at present one of the most prominent artists of our stage, appeared before the management of a certain theater for engagement. He was asked to recite before the manager, the stage manager and the critic. His lines were, or they began:

"Ye chieftains, honored most in this our land,
Our sacred Queen Jocasta—she is dead!"

Up starts the stage manager: "No, my boy; all wrong! This is the way you must stand—so; and begin—so:

"Ye chieftains, honored most in this our land,
Our sacred Queen Jocasta—she is dead!"

"You see, it is like the business in Marc Antony's speech on the Forum: 'You gentle Romans, I come to bury Cæsar!' This is the way to do it; your point is the word 'dead.' You are to try for a hand there. Hold it until they applaud.

"Ye chieftains, honored most in this our land,
Our sacred Queen Jocasta—she is dead!"

"No; give it again. That's not a bit like it."

The actor tries again and again, learns to imitate his master's tones and gestures.

"Mr. Smith," speaks up the little proprietor, "I think that if Mr. A. puts more emphasis on 'honored' in his first lines, and pauses after 'chieftains,' the meaning will be clearer. You see, the 'chieftains' is not a new idea. The proper and emphatic word is 'honored,' and the secondary emphasis on 'most.'"

"By the way, 'honored,' if you please; yes, 'honored,' etc., etc. Then the second line should have a falling inflection on 'Jocasta.'"

"Ye chieftains, etc."

"If you will analyze the exact meanings of the line in that way, Mr. A., you will deliver it much more intelli-

gently. You should think more at rehearsals. Don't you think so, Mr. Critic?"

"I—I hesitate to say."

"Oh, yes," says the stage manager, "give us your idea, Mr. Critic."

"I see the value of your plan, Mr. Stage Manager, and of yours, Mr. Proprietor. But, may I ask, Mr. A., what it is that brings him upon the scene at this moment in the play?" "I came to announce the death of the Queen." "How did you know of her death?" "Why—oh, yes—I stumbled upon her body in the doorway." "What impression did you receive?" "I was horror-struck, breathless and trembling." "Very good! There she lies! See her! Now come on and tell us about it."

We teachers are all critics. The best critic is the one who understands best the life that is portrayed. For it is all a matter of re-presentation of human life as we know it to-day—this dramatic art.

"The critic should be sincere, simple, flexible, ardent, ever widening his knowledge," said Matthew Arnold.

I might dwell at great length upon all the minute technicalities—questions of tempo, position, movement and what not, the importance of drawing out the salient meanings, of picturing and musical characteristics, the inter-relation with the audience; I might draw attention to what we all know are mere platitudes, the correspondencies with music and the plastic arts—all of which have their bearing upon this art,—but I must not take time for that. I must, in order to get at any result, seek for the general, grander, larger principles by which we must pass judgment.

There are two great dangers in criticism, as I see it. First, the danger of over-generalization, the literary way of doing things, in which the actualities of life are overlooked; and the other extreme is the danger of being too gossipy and personal—the "little reporters little report," as Mr. Shepherd has called it.

I remember, on the first night that Henry Irving played in this country, that, after the first act, all the critics present assembled in the lobby and unanimously condemned this man for his atrocious mannerisms, his garishness, vocally and physically, and found nothing valuable in what he accomplished. I shall never forget the tall figure of

Steele Mackaye as it came among them, crushing them by his denunciation of their littleness, revealing the fact that, in their over-attention to the very superficial mannerisms of the man, they had overlooked the grand spirit of the artist.

If we consider any of the great people that we have seen in the past—shall I name some of them? Nielson, Fechter, Booth, Monet-Sully, Salvini, Edwin Forrest—the men and women who always left you a little richer and with more fullness of soul when you left the theater; what is the great quality in these great artists? I think it needs no proof that it is the revelation of human nature above all things, and allowing nothing to interfere with the truth of that revelation; and, if anything does interfere, brushing it away; human nature, simplicity, grandeur of imagination, disinterestedness, sincerity—in short, character, and the motive “to give for the sake of giving.”

And this leads us to the ethical principle which all the greater critics, from Plato to Lessing, have acknowledged, and which I believe is the highest standard for judgment of all, and is an answer to the query: “What do we in front gain; what do we carry away that helps us to better life?”

To epitomize, what we want and ought to have at the theater are the permanent values in the solution of the problems of life—sincerity, truthful representation, without waste of words or action, and with technical workmanship up to the best standards of the time. And, if I have any criticism which I ought to make of our journalistic judges, the professional critics, it is that they are woefully and universally ignorant upon that matter of technique.

The other day I had the pleasure of seeing an old Sanskrit play, “Sakuntala,” which is contemporary, probably, with the earliest classical Greek dramas; and I was forcibly struck with two things: First, the fact that human emotion was the same in those days as it is now, and that, second, the thing that everybody cares for is life as we know it to-day. The dressing, etc., interests us temporarily, but the thing that remains with us is that which appeals to our knowledge—our own experiences of life.

The critic knows “there is a mode in plays, as well as clothes”; and, while we cannot treat any two plays alike, there must be some general standards of criticism that dominate all.

Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, in his interesting book, "The Renaissance of the Drama," quotes Matthew Arnold, who, in turn, quotes St. Beuve, who, in turn, quotes some classical authority unknown, that "we go to the theater to be amused, but," he adds, "the problem is whether we are rightly amused."

Lest we may sacrifice the soul, the poetry and human meaning, to pictorial or literary embellishment, the interpretation of the performance demands our greater attention; and, in this respect, a very curious anomaly is the variety of schools represented in the performance of any one play. No two actors use the same method, act in the same key or present harmony in style of representation. There is the traditional method, which ought to be like a necklace, to be taken off or put on as we wish. There is the nature school, in which the claim is nature as the person of ordinary life understands nature, rather than as the old-time Greek understood it. There is the school of a famous playwright, actor and stage manager, William Gillette. When I asked him once to give an address before a class, he said: "I have only these words to give them, 'Don't act; simply be.'" He was the man, who, in this country at least, first cut out the "asides" and "soliloquies."

If we were to put to the test of a performance before children, provided it was entirely understood, down on the East Side, before the ignorant and uneducated people, before a gallery audience, we should learn many things that we cannot learn from a very sophisticated audience on Broadway. I remember an Irish woman who went to see a famous actor whom you have all seen, and who came back doubled up with laughter, trying to relate all the ridiculous, amusing, extremely funny things that he did—and she described her impressions, by the way, of a famous tragedian in the part of Othello, and I have no doubt it was a very just criticism.

Oddly enough, Mr. Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his essay on "Eloquence," gives a very explicit and clear picture of this mode of acting which is to be avoided. He says:

"We are much reminded of a medical experiment, when a series of patients are taking nitrous oxide gas. Each patient exhibits similar symptoms—redness in the face, volubility, violent gesticulations, delirious attitudes, occasional stamping, an alarming loss of perception of the pas-

sage of time, a selfish enjoyment of his sensations, and loss of perception of the sufferings of the audience."

The French rarely blunder in such crude ways. Remember the soubrette, for instance, a soubrette of this country or of England, and then think of the soubrette of France. The French soubrette has an entrance to make, which is nothing more than an expression of apparent indifference, as she stands in the doorway. You can see the over-elaboration of the Anglo-Saxon treatment. You can realize the simplicity of the French artist, as she stands quietly in the doorway, with one hand on the knob, and swings the door; and, when she is discovered and spoken to, she simply turns her head, and she has told all that is necessary, all that is worth telling.

We have learned a great deal from the past, a great deal from the great masters, some of whom I have mentioned. I think it would be interesting to you—and perhaps there will be some novelty of thought in it—to realize that the original drama in this country, and the original elocutionary study went hand in hand.

Our first elocutionist in this country—I am stating this not merely as a matter of fact, but as leading up to a point I should like to prove—was James Fennell. His was what we call to-day the natural school, in the better sense. He was an English actor. Following him came the school of technique, of mechanism, of exercises, of which Dr. Rush was high chief, and the actors Vandenhoff, Murdoch and Frobisher, his chief disciples. Following him came a school which sought to unite those two methods, and which, in the effort, has become, as it did with Louis B. Munroe and some of his successors, what we might almost call the transcendental school, which I think we all have learned to appreciate and to value.

The best school, whatever its name, represents not artifice or cleverness, but truth, selected, reflected, refined and therefore simplified; a reflection of the great joys and great griefs that are for life everlasting, that make all the lesser things that we are so apt to criticise and think about seem trivial, the great moments of silence, when the heart is full,—the sigh that all understand and respond to.

I recall an old-time actor who had a situation which was most effective as written, but which went for nothing as spoken, in which the audience laughed at his most pathetic

parts, using their handkerchiefs in order to hide their laughter; and it was a very pathetic speech, in which the poor actor's voice was broken by emotion. He stalked off the stage, angry and discomfited. I asked him to do less and suggest more, to leave more for the audience to do, not to give way to, but to master his emotion in the part.

He did not understand my reasoning, and did not want to do it, but he had to, and he went on again before a matinee audience and read his lines, mechanically making the right pauses, calmly, collectedly. He said: "Twenty years ago my sweetheart and I stood on the bridge at Stamford. We'd had a tiff. We parted, I to the hulks, she to the churchyard. Good-night, sir!" and went off. And the house was full of sobs and tears. And still the old actor did not understand it.

And the theater people, what do they say? The first one who would like to be called a theater person, you know, is the dilettante, who, as Charles Lamb has it, sees the obvious "first night" view—first, the setting; second, the personality of the actor; third, the surface defects. We can pass him by. Then the actor who judges everything as to whether it agree with his own method. Then the stage manager, whose first thought, as a rule, is first upon the selection of the play, second upon the selection of the cast, third, upon the placing of the people.

Only a few best stage directors recognize symbolism as the greatest first principle and the expression of the feeling in himself and in the actor as the true source of inspiration and concentration, enthusiasm and responsiveness as the great guiding thoughts by which the actor "reaches quite through the souls of men."

The actor will go through his performance well, if he has these three characteristics: Concentration, enthusiasm, responsiveness.

Then the manager; what shall we do to him? Or, rather, what shall he do to us?—for he has full power in this nebulous state of the theater; for, although with him force is right, what other standard have we until there shall be more standards mutually agreed upon? Until the theatrical millennium, then, the manager will have a right to his authority. And we must not expect fine distinctions from him, because he is a practical man; he does not deal with ethical art. I, of course, do not refer to great artists like

David Belasco or Charles Frohman, who, while known to the public primarily as business men and executive, clever men, succeed distinctively because of their artistic ability.

Classicism is the model, because it typifies the ideals of nature. Modern characterizations in a truly fine play must help the revelation of ideal principles, rather than factitious reality.

What are these principles? At the risk of telling you what may seem mere platitudes, which you already know, I hope to give you something, if you will watch the words as I give them, which present these principles from a new point of view as applied to our subject.

Sensation comes properly before anything else in impression.

Our first sensation should be that of unity, of parts of one whole; every word contributing, every situation significant, every color and form manifestative of the central idea. This central vein shows itself at the outset like a text. The manifestation of this principle of unity is in the freedom, ease, novelty, focusing of situation, and rhythmic pulse and movement of the drama. The establishment of this fact of unity is the first act of dramatic judgment—is the first great standard of criticism. It is the first right sensation, the source of magnetism and attraction.

Next, the mind sees distinctions of separate parts; dualities or contrasts in detail; diversity; variety; forms of sounds, sense and emotion; values; a tune; a collection of incidents, valuable in so far as they offset each other. We have passed from the sensation of discovery to the intelligent interest of suspense.

Then comes the blending of the two impressions, unity and duality, $1 + 2$ in the principle of trinity, which means symmetrical succession, growth, aim, harmony (of voice, action, effects), tone color or quality of living movement, which, in its essence, is movement in the passage of time—the anticipation—search and desire for some culminating good.

Have you ever seen the portrait of Mr. Garrick—the several portraits of Garrick—in that famous collection of London, no two alike, and noted that readiness to assume any form of emotion in all, and in all of the faces that note of deep sympathy?

The picture I see of the stage of the future is this: A chapel of art, containing a race of men and women, cultivated in body, mind and emotional nature, with exquisite sensibility, finely-attuned instruments, great executive force; a stage setting and theatrical accompaniments presenting a suitable background to representations of problems which illustrate human motives and present passages of lives worth repeating, and worth impressing upon the beholder, for the sake, as Aristotle has said, "of purging the emotions" of spectator and auditor.

As a summary, the great standards seem to be:

Character—secondarily, Characterization.

Charm—secondarily, Personality.

Correctness, rather than Cleverness, and their manifestation, through the means of

Repose (and Reservation),

Variety (and Economy),

Sympathy (and Outreach for the Sublime).

And we, the audience, as by-standers, must be taken into the actor's confidence and sympathies more or less intimately, according to the style of play—listeners and by-standers for the sake of "right amusement," for the purpose of learning new ideas on the problems of life, as gleaned from this "composite art of the theater."

MRS. ELIZABETH MANSFIELD IRVING IN THE CHAIR.

STANDARDS OF CRITICISM IN LITERARY INTERPRETATION.

MR. P. M. PEARSON, SWARTHMORE, PA.

I appreciate that it is much easier, and less effective, to talk about standards of any kind than to realize those standards. Leland Powers is fond of telling a story of two elocutionists who took part in Browning's "In a Balcony." The young woman who played the rôle of Constance did her work artistically, and was the success of the play. At a subsequent meeting of the Browning Society, before which the play was presented, the actors were asked to discuss their parts. The man who played Norbert read a learned paper,

in which he told with much profundity all that he saw in the character.

When the young woman who had eclipsed the others was called on, she said simply: "I can't say anything more about the character; I told you all I could when I read the lines." Though the society did not take it as such, it was a just rebuke to all those who seek to have literature made over into homœopathic doses, even to the thousandth trituration.

The elocutionist who can interpret is above the critic who tries to tell how to criticize the interpretation.

Though there are recognized standards, we ought not to mistake the talk about these, as the ability to realize them.

In this discussion I have but one point I wish to make, but I must come to it by a process of elimination. Perhaps the most obvious standard by which we are to judge literary interpretation is the technique. The voice must be flexible, pure, pleasing and commanding. In getting these qualities, bugle notes, bird tones, trills and the like may have their place, but it is a secondary one. They are means, never the end. Many a young student has been allowed to think such tricks the marks of a great ability. This has become so manifest a fault with us that the average audience is surprised if an elocutionist goes through an evening without trotting out these little acquirements, a sort of "Home, Sweet Home, with Variations."

Yet, we must recognize that a reader without a well-trained voice may interpret literature. One of the most successful Extension lecturers of our time reads Shakespeare with wonderful power. He is not an elocutionist; indeed, he breaks all of the laws of the art; any one of us could do the technique much better; yet few, if any, of us can read so well as he.

On the other hand, a trained elocutionist whom I heard read the quarrel between Brutus and Cassius was all voice. His voice was rich and deep, and wonderfully flexible. He ran up and down the scale with such ease that I envied him—until he had done it several times—then I tired of it. He said:

"You say you are a better soldier; let it appear so:" (illustrating with rising and descending inflection), exhibiting (?) in a way I cannot imitate. He did that so often

that a layman sitting by me said: "Why, he hasn't a lick of sense." When he had finished, my conception of Brutus and Cassius was a couple of elocutionists doing exercises for voice effect.

If your patience allowed, I might discuss control of the body, an important subject, but it is only secondary with the elocutionist.

The most important thing we should ask ourselves is, then, Is the interpretation emotional? By that I do not mean that the standard is, How much hysteria has been put into, or onto, a piece of literature? but, Does the interpretation reveal the heart, the soul, the spiritual power of life? As Hamilton Wright Mabie says, "Great books are born, not in the intellect, but in the experience." The great literature of any nation expresses, not so much the thought of the nation, but the heart throbs, the joy, the grief, the controlling passions of the people, their purposes, their desires, and their creative imagination. He who reads this literature to us must express the emotions which are its essence, life and power. To be sure, this can only be done by an intelligent man, one well trained in literature, history and art. But, what I insist on is, that our first standard of criticism is that the interpretation shall be emotional, rather than intellectual. How many times have we seen that scholars fail in reading literature because their interpretation was only intellectual? Such men know the origin, history and most recondite usage of every word; they have exact information as to every direct or indirect reference of the text; yet, they cannot read well, cannot read expressively or effectively. They have information and wisdom, but little or no imagination, without which even the greatest masterpieces become so many problems to solve.

The elocutionist should know what the text means; he should know the times of which the literature he seeks to interpret is an expression; he should know the life of the author, but these are only secondary in the preparation. The essential thing is, Does he imagine the whole scene; does he re-people the play with the real characters; does he group the emotions for which the words of the author are but signs? Does he feel all this? If so, he has begun well; but we cannot yet pronounce upon his interpretation, for as yet there is none. Can he,—does he re-create all this, and

make it live again in your imagination, and mine, as we listen? If not, he falls short of the first and greatest standard by which he is to be judged. If he fails, he cannot rebel against the standard; it is the essential test of all art.

Dr. Richard Burton says he used to examine his students in literature, not so much to find whether they knew the meaning of the text, but to learn whether or not they would cry at the right place.

But more is required of the elocutionist. He must not only be so keenly appreciative as to meet Dr. Burton's test; he must have the power to make others cry at the right place.

Though the chief test of literary interpretation is the emotional, I am not sure but that, as elocutionists, we need to know more about literature than we do. It is not always necessary to know what a poem means; we may feel what it means, and thus interpret it correctly. Nor is it essential that we should be able to talk learnedly about a poem. It is, nevertheless, true that the large class of those who attempt to interpret literature, those whom the laymen call elocutionists, do need to know more, as well as feel more.

I think it is not surprising that our profession has something of an unsavory name, when girls and boys who have little or no scholastic training are encouraged to become teachers and professional readers.

Since these abuses continue, we must not be surprised that educators look askance at our work. One of the most prominent educators in Ohio told me that his test of an elocutionist is: if a dog comes in answer to your call, that is talk; if he runs from you, that is elocution.

Though popular feeling is often exaggerated and unwarranted, yet there is usually some ground for it. I have not seen all of the New York papers this week, but I feel sure that some one of them has reprinted the old story which originated when the State adopted electrocution: "Say, George, what do they do with criminals in your State?" "Well, they hang them in our State, but in New York they kill them by elocution."

There must be an intellectual standard for interpretation. The elocutionist should know the poem; he should know the life of the author; he should know the history of the time. Though such information has only a secondary place in interpretation, yet without it the imagination is

halt and blind, and stumbles into many dark places where it must eternally grope for light.

I should like to add one more essential: Is the interpretation sensible; is the emotional conception controlled by good judgment? But, after all, this may be, as I think it is, the right proportion of knowledge and emotion.

These, then, are the important standards, as I conceive them. The technique,—this is important, but not indispensable. If people say, "How *do* you do it?" we should be warned. People always marvel when they see the wheels go round. We must judge the interpretation by the knowledge of the elocutionist. He must *know* the literature, and, understanding it, he must feel it.

Yet this is not the great essential. The comment from the audience should not be, "How deeply he felt it!" but "How profoundly moved we were!" An intelligent and sympathetic person may understand and feel the text, but the supreme test of the elocutionist is, Does he make others understand it and feel it?

Discussion

TUESDAY, JUNE 26.

MRS. IRVING (In the Chair): In the absence of Mr. Edward S. Ott, who was to have read a paper for us, I will open for discussion Mr. Sargent's paper, although the President had postponed it until Friday morning. Will it be agreeable to you, Mr. Sargent, if we discuss your paper this morning?

MR. SARGENT: Certainly, Madam.

MR. RUMMELL: I should like to have Mr. Sargent define a little more comprehensively what he means by "traditional method of acting."

MR. SARGENT: I spoke sarcastically. I presume Mr. Rummell, however, means in a legitimate sense. The knowledge of tradition is a grand thing. "Tradition" is what the best people have done in the past. For instance, the French theater is built upon tradition. We have traditions that embody essential principles as well as the tricks of the trade. I spoke of it in my paper more as referring to the sort of thing we sometimes see in an old stager, the hitches, the hesitations, the pauses, and the grandiloquence of style. Over-formality, I should say, would be the bad side of tradition; and a preservation of the best that the artists of the past have been, would be the best side of tradition.

MR. SILVERNAIL: I want to express my appreciation, not only of the paper Mr. Sargent has given us, but of the work Mr. Sargent is doing along these lines. (Applause.) I want to express my appreciation of the elaborateness of the plans detailed, the clearness of perception Mr. Sargent shows in his work.

MR. RUMMELL: I should like to utter just one caution that was suggested to me by Mr. Pearson's paper. What an audience says to you after you have finished is a very unsafe thing to be guided by. (Applause.) I have seen people approach a reader, in whose work there was nothing to praise, and I knew that they felt it to be so; but the courteous thing required them to say: "I enjoyed it very

much," and I knew that they lied. The reader did not know it, of course. He believed it—or she did, rather. I have also seen people in an audience so overcome by good work upon the part of the reader that, when they approached him afterwards, they could say nothing—simply could say nothing.

There are several things we must remember about such criticism. In the first place, those who speak to us do not know how to criticise. They may have been stirred very deeply, but they cannot say it. I can go back to my own experience as a young pupil in this work. In the school in which I first studied we had critical classes, in which the pupils were allowed to criticise the work of each other. It is amusing to me now to recall how little I could say when I was called upon to criticise. And how would it be with others who had no training, and little or no inclination to study the art?

And then, again, people may say many things because they have formed the habit of saying them. I have had people say to me: "How did you do it?"—not a great compliment, but that is what they said. But afterwards, when those people expressed their real feelings, it was something very different from that. The reason I make this suggestion is, that we are too apt to think we have succeeded sometimes when we have failed, and sometimes we think we have failed when we have made our greatest successes. And again, remember that the power of attention on the part of individuals in your audiences varies very greatly. It is not your fault, always, if you fail to hold the attention of a scatter-brained person. He simply cannot be held, that is all. It is not in him, and when he finally tells you what he thinks of your work, he will pick out some little detail that did not please him, perhaps; you will think it has been because he has seen some little minor thing that he ought to have overlooked.

Now, I believe thoroughly, with Mr. Pearson, that the test is what he said it was; but you cannot tell whether your work has affected your audience by what they say to you when they are fresh from that work. It takes some little time for them to get their emotions balanced.

MR. TEMPLE: Don't you think that it is your place to make the audience feel with you, or to make your audience feel that you know whether you are stirring them, whether

you are one with your audience? Don't you know that? You make them feel, and they make you feel. Your audience are bound to show you, not from what they say to you; you know it intuitively.

(Mr. Fulton is requested to speak.)

MR. FULTON: I have come in late, and I am just trying to get the drift of the Association work; and I am sure that I shall get my thinking cap on, and be ready to make some suggestions a little later in the week.

I have certainly enjoyed the papers which were given this morning, and commend them both most heartily. There are points yet to be raised, I think, especially in the second paper, which I feel we should hardly attempt to handle in the brief time which we have before us.

When we asked for "Standards" we wanted definite standards, that those of us who have not had experience, and who do not grasp fully the rights and duties of the teacher of expression, may take hold of and use; and, if I were to ask Mr. Pearson to add to his paper, I should ask him to make some definite statement of the Standards of Criticism. If I were to criticise the paper, I should say that the criticisms offered were too general; there was not definiteness about them. They were the things which the public say of us. Are there definite principles of criticism to be attained, by which a standard may be maintained,—such a standard as the young teacher may take up and follow in his teaching? In Mr. Sargent's paper I could see a line of standards of criticism which I could follow, and which my pupils could follow; and there was a definiteness there that I think we can take hold of.

Now, the discussion of this morning's papers would require more time than we have at hand. I am very much obliged to my friends for calling me out, but I wish you had waited until I got ready to make a speech.

MISS OSTRANDER: Inasmuch as we are taking up the subject of the "magic art" this morning, I should like to ask Mr. Sargent whether he cannot give me a distinction between "Dramatic Elocution" and "Dramatic Art." I will give my reason for asking this question. A pupil came to me during the past year, and the first time I asked her to give selections by which I might judge of her work she asked me whether she should give this selection in the "elocution" way or in the "dramatic art" way. (Laugh-

ter.) I said: "Give it any way that you please, only give it." So she gave the selection in the "elocution" way. She stood up before me with a very agonized facial expression, and started a few lines. I stopped her, and said: "Now give it in the 'dramatic art' way." Then she took a seat by the side of my table, and placed her elbow on the corner, and was very dramatic. I told her to read some selection from Shakespeare. I said: "That will do." Then I asked her whether her teacher had told her that one was the "elocution" way and one the "dramatic art" way. She said that she had. Now, this teacher is prominent in a way, and for that reason I ask Mr. Sargent whether he can explain to us the difference.

MR. SARGENT: Madam Chairman, I was not that teacher. There are so many good things abused in this world, and the word "elocution" is one of them. We students in dramatic art claim a great deal, I know. When I spoke of it as a composite art, I claimed that it included almost everything, and included elocution. I suppose that what that poor, deluded teacher meant was that elocution, as she understood it, was a tradition, an old-fashioned thing, the preservation of certain formalities, in which the spirit and the life of the thing were not the main issues. I presume that was her idea of it.

I am very glad to be on my feet just for a moment to thank my critics. I thought, myself, that my paper was very general, very vague,—very, perhaps, impractical. I am very glad if it reached anyone in a practical way. On the other hand, I found in Mr. Pearson's paper a mode of statement which I envied very much. I remember so clearly and firmly everything he said.

I curiously overlooked the fact in my paper,—I don't know what brought it to my mind,—that the attitude of the critic and of the teacher (for they are one) is a matter of more seriousness than we suppose. Someone said to me yesterday: "You are doing something here"—(I do not know that he referred to me especially, but to other teachers engaged in my line of thought)—"You are doing something different, and I want to know what it is." Suddenly something occurred to me which I think is meritorious in dramatic teaching. There is a mistaken mode of criticizing in which you dominate the pupil, in which your own conception of anything is the superior thing, and the pupil

is simply absorbed in it. That is the actor's function. The actor is the dominating element. The critic, I think, should subordinate himself to the person criticised.

The teacher and critic should take a subordinated attitude, not a dominating attitude, toward the person criticised. (Applause.)

MRS. GIELOW: I have just a little story to tell in regard to the experience of readers. I had a lady tell me once that, in giving a reading on one occasion, three persons in the audience had violent hysterics, and had to be carried out. This was Mrs. Ruth McEnergy Stuart. She told me that she was telling that story to another reciter, and he said: "That is better than my own experience. On one occasion I was called on to give a reading, and I did so. I started out with my very best jokes, and I noticed my audience did not even smile. 'Have they heard them before? What is the matter with them?' I thought. I racked my brain to find the best joke I knew. Not a smile; no encouragement of any kind. Finally I thought of some other joke, and tried it, but failed."

When the recital was over he snatched up his hat in desperation and made for the door. He had never suffered so much in his life; but, when he got to the door, he heard one person remark to another: "I never tried so hard in my life not to laugh, but I would not let my manners get the best of me."

Now, I should like to ask, are we to judge by the effect we create on the audience?

MRS. IRVING: I understand that, although our time for discussion of these two papers is up for the present, they can be taken up on Friday morning, and then the readers of the papers will be present, and the members can have an opportunity to ask any questions, or take up the different points in the papers. Our time is up.

MR. HAWN: Before giving you a four-minutes' recess, I have one or two announcements to make.

You will notice on the program I have left the Committees upon Resolutions, Pronunciation and Necrology open, to be appointed at this time.

The following appointments are announced:

RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. John P. Silvernail, Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. John Rummell, Buffalo, N. Y.

Miss Cora M. Wheeler, Utica, N. Y.

PRONUNCIATION.

Mr. Franklin H. Sargent, New York City.

Miss Anna Warren Story, New York City.

Miss Marie Ware Laughton, Boston, Mass.

The duty of this committee is to call attention to all mispronunciation of words used either from the platform or from the floor.

NECROLOGY.

Mr. Robert I. Fulton, Delaware, O.

Mrs. Ida M. Moore, St. Louis, Mo.

Mrs. Elizabeth R. Walton, Washington, D.C.

MR. HAWN: To-morrow morning we have the election of the Nominating Committee. This is done, of course, from the floor; so I believe in a most thorough canvass in a body of this kind,—a most thorough canvass as to who are the best men or women to occupy this post of honor. I do not believe in “snap.” So, please begin from this time on to talk among yourselves upon the men and women who are to carry on the work of this Convention. That will be done from the floor to-morrow morning, just preceding the section work in Methods of Teaching. We will devote a few minutes to the election of the Nominating Committee.

11.30 a.m.—VOLUNTEER RECITALS FOR CRITICISM.

MR. HAWN: Any member of the Association is privileged to give a reading or recitation not to exceed five minutes in length, and to be criticised by an invited committee of three. Critics allowed three minutes each.

I think you will find this a really valuable aid to your work, if you will avail yourselves of this privilege to have your colleagues criticise you kindly and tell you the impression they get of your interpretation work.

MRS. HADLEY: I will be the first victim. I will read "Forgiveness," a poem by Browning. I should like to have Mr. Fulton, Mr. Sargent and Mrs. Carter for my critics. I cannot give this recitation in five minutes, but you can stop me.

MR. FULTON: Please appoint some one else in my place.

MRS. HADLEY: I will appoint Mr. Soper.

Mrs. Hadley then recited a poem of Browning's.

MR. HAWN: Three minutes will be allowed each critic for criticism. Mr. Soper, I think you took Mr. Fulton's place. Mr. Fulton was made chairman of that Committee of Criticism.

MR. SOPER: I noticed that perhaps in the first part of the poem there was a lack of force. The interpretation was very good indeed, very good work. I am not familiar with the poem.

MR. SARGENT: The first impression I received was one of admiration for the lady's courage; and the second, admiration for the beautiful melange of words the poet indulges in. I do not know that it is fair for me to criticise. I do not know that I can say how the thing should be read aloud. I do not understand the value of such a purely intellectual piece of work. It does not arouse any sentiment. If it must be read aloud, then I say that the reader should vivify it, should lose her own identity, should drown herself in it, and feel so much in love with it that we do not have to work so hard to find the poem through the interpreter. As I looked around the faces everyone was straining. Perhaps that was inevitable. I do not know. It is so with me. I am a Philistine, and I acknowledge it; and I can say with Mr. Soper, that I am entirely unfamiliar with it. It is entirely out of my line of study, and I have no desire or intention to go into such things,—no time or leisure to go into such super-intellectual pursuits. I admire the effort and intelligence the lady gave to it; and that she could command our effort and intelligence,—but there was too much effort on both sides.

MR. HAWN: This is good work,—this recitation for criticism. It brings out good work which we could never discover otherwise.

MRS. CARTER: I will try, Mr. Chairman, not to poach upon the thoughts that have been given. I do not quite agree with Mr. Sargent's criticism. I think there is much

in the poem besides that which is intellectual. I admired very greatly some of the qualities of tone in the lady's voice, but she handles her tones at the end of the sentences in the wrong way. She seemed to squeeze them. I do not know just how she did it, but, towards the end of the sentence, they all seemed crammed in. I should say that the poem was read monotonously on that account. Where she spoke of the wave coming out, her voice seemed to come in "spurts." And where she said: "As I turned, there stood my wife, stone-still, stone-white," which should be spoken with passion, she said it in the same way that she read the beginning of the poem (illustrating). The picture was all one color; there was no one thought brought into the foreground,—no perspective.

And then she fails to have relaxation in the throat, and force in the diaphragm. She reverses this law.

That, I think, would cover the whole criticism of the poem. That would make us fail to see the different personalities in the poem. There were one or two words I would criticise the pronunciation of, "fancy" and "beneath." I dislike, however, to criticise one's pronunciation, but I happen to know those two.

MRS. HADLEY: I am glad to get the criticism; but, when one is impersonating anybody, one cannot go too much into detail; one cannot have too much color in the picture.

MR. SARGENT: I want to ask the victim one question, in self-defense. I accused the poem of being intellectual. If it is not, why wasn't it?

MRS. CARTER: I appreciate the remark that Mrs. Hadley made. I do not mean that she did not impersonate correctly, but I do think the whole picture lacked color, even if she did.

MR. HAWN: Now for the second victim. Please make up your minds as to who will speak, and who will not. Let someone else recite, please. We are to have this little session for volunteer recitations daily, and I wish you would summon up the courage to come prepared to say something. Is there someone else who will recite this morning?

MR. RUMMELL: Is not the time up,—12 o'clock?

MR. HAWN: No; I began a little late. Well, I announce myself as a victim.

MRS. CARTER: I should like to have a criticism upon the recitation of last night.

MR. HAWN: That scarcely comes under this heading. It may come in on Friday.

MR. SILVERNAIL: Mr. Chairman, with all respect to Mrs. Carter's spirit,—and I appreciate her disinterestedness,—I think it is establishing a precedent we cannot afford to establish here now, to open for discussion the readings of our friends who entertain us in the evenings. I do not believe that we ought to do that.

MR. HAWN: The Chair agrees with you. Well, I shall offer myself. (Applause.)

Whether I interest you in this particular recitation or not in the matter of delivery, I am sure I shall in the matter of the construction of the poem. It is a wonderful thing, this poem, in itself, entitled "The Toy Commandments." I hope it is not familiar to many of you, because I want to offer you the selection. It is a beautiful, reflective thing.

MRS. CARTER: You have not chosen your critics, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HAWN: I will choose for my critics Mr. Putnam, Mr. Rummell and Miss Schuster.

Mr. Hawn recited the poem.

MR. PUTNAM: Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me that the physical response to the feeling, on the whole, was very true, indeed. In the first part there was, it seemed to me, a lack of thought, and it was shown in the fact that he presented the thought in the same way at the beginning, then changed as he got interested. It suggested to me what is such a common fault, of our starting before we are really ready. He worked up to the subject as the ordinary orator does. As he went along he got it better than at first. The word "fancy" was pronounced "fancy" (illustrating with broad "a"). That was the only mispronunciation. Those are the criticisms.

MR. HAWN: I thank you very much.

MR. RUMMELL: The recitation had the effect upon me that Mr. Pearson said a selection should have upon an audience; it reduced me to tears. I did not prepare a criticism, as I did not know that I was on the committee. I have very

little to find fault with, after what Mr. Putnam has said. I am a little inclined to take issue with Mr. Putnam, for that matter. I do not see any special reason why there should be so much evidence of emotion at the outset. The emotion grew as the selection went on. To me it seemed a very effective piece of work, very beautiful. It was beautiful physically, and I think oratorically, too. It held me enthralled from beginning to end. I know that Mr. Hawn did not give that for the sake of calling out compliments, but I haven't anything else to say.

MISS SCHUSTER: In the opening lines, I should say, you did not concentrate our attention because your mind was not concentrated in the beginning, but, as you entered more thoroughly into the selection, you carried us with you, and your lack of concentration was evident, in your failure to get our attention first, and hold us, and then to get your effect afterwards; you did not pause. At the last, as Mr. Rummell says, we were left almost without any power of criticism, because we felt with you. In the beginning you made us see Mr. Hawn, rather than what you were telling; but you left us with a thorough impression that you knew and felt what you were doing.

MR. HAWN: I suppose the victim has the last word. I have never "tried it on the dog" before. I have never used that before an audience, and, as usual in such cases, I am sorry to say I left out perhaps the most beautiful part of the poem—about twenty lines,—which I did not know until I had made my bow. The other point is this: I am suffering myself, despite my good ears, from being unable to understand more than half you people say in this hall. The consequence is, the poem is only half heard. It is a soliloquy, and should be spoken softly, without effort to pitch the voice so that you could get my words. As to the change of voice, I want to criticise my critic. Personally I do not believe in change of voice or gesture; I believe in sticking to one key-note on the piano, unless there is some reason for changing that. The consequence is that I have ten or twelve lines there which contained one train of running thought. I am not defending my own delivery, understand. I know its imperfections; but I know of people who get up and read, and at once they begin the critical emotion of getting rhythm and accent and modulation merely as such, which I try entirely to avoid. So I do not mind hav-

ing shown a lack of variety of tone. For about ten lines there is but one thought, and it occurs to me the tone coloring in that one thought should be one tone, more or less. Thank you very much.

Tuesday Evening

HENRY GAINES HAWN, PRESIDING.

Music. "Reverie," Vieuxtemps.

DEZSO NEMES (the Hungarian violinist).

MRS. NEMES, Accompanist.

Reading. "The Story of the Iron Cross," Gilbert Parker.

"The First Born," Burns.

MISS MARTEA GOULD POWELL, Denver, Col.

Music. (a) "Canzonetta," D'Ambrosio.

(b) "Berceuse," C. Cui.

DEZSO NEMES.

Reading. "Human Nature on the Hannibal and St. Juan," Eugene Field.

"L'Aiglon," Act II., Rostand.

MISS HELEN MERCI SCHUSTER, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Music. "Hungarian Gypsy Scenes," Hubay.

DEZSO NEMES.

Reading. Miscellaneous.

FRED EMERSON BROOKS.

Session of the Main Body

Wednesday, June 29th, 10 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR.

MR. HAWN: This morning's talks are to be on "Technique," as yesterday's were on "Standards of Criticism." The first talk, or paper, on "Technique" is Miss Mary S.

Thompson's, of New York city, on the "Use of Visible Speech to the Elocutionist."

"THE USE OF VISIBLE SPEECH TO THE
ELOCUTIONIST."

MISS MARY S. THOMPSON, NEW YORK CITY.

Philologists have labored in vain to evolve a system of arbitrary signs and diacritic marks which should represent all languages by one alphabet.

They relinquished the task, and formally declared in conference that it was an impossibility.

The reason for their failure was simple. They were unacquainted with the practical working of speech machinery.

They fixed their minds on letters and their combinations and tried to fit them to combinations of sound.

Meantime, one of our own profession put his mind—or rather his ear—upon this subject. Nature had endowed him with an ear which distinguished the minutest shades of sound. The son of a distinguished elocutionist, he had, in common with the sons of famous physicians, an unconscious knowledge of things professional, a knowledge which outsiders must labor to acquire. Added to this advantage, his professional experience brought him in contact with every variety of speech and dialect within British dominion, as well as with those of America and foreign lands.

Not a sound or shade of sound in this vast kaleidoscope of sound escaped his vigilant ear.

The medical scientist resorts to vivisection before he completes his study in the art of healing. The inventor of visible speech may be said to have vivisected speech.

As a result, he achieved the universal language of which philosophers and philologists had dreamed.

In 1865-67, it was submitted to the test of eminent scientists and phoneticians, and universally accepted. In 1904 philologists and phoneticians continue to regard it the one complete system of phonetics.

In like manner occurred the discovery of that instrument by which the treatment of obscure diseases of the throat is made possible.

The laryngoscope was invented by Garcia, the great master of sound in song.

Bell and Garcia were teaching in London at the same

time. I am told by one who was a pupil of both that their methods of voice production were identical.

Bell defines speech as differing from song in the following manner: Every word or accented syllable uttered in speech slides either up or down. In song each word or syllable is poised upon a given note, and the voice progresses by definite steps.

The colloquial slide is shorter in quantity than the vocabulary or formal slide. The knowledge and application of this principle does away with the wrong use of the oratorical tone. (Illustrations.)

The principle of syllabication is the same in speech and song; viz., from close to open. The division of syllables given in dictionaries belongs to orthography; that in visible speech, to sound. (Illustrations.) "Sa-cred," instead of "sac-red." The glides which are much elided in colloquial speech are almost entirely elided in song. (Illustration.)

Alexander Melville Bell, the inventor of visible speech, occupies a position analagous to that of the French savant, M. de Chevreuil. This distinguished Frenchman was present at a convention comprising most of the noted scientists of France. Some of his own discoveries were brought forward and claimed as recent inventions by members of a later generation.

"Gentlemen," said this aged seer, "I had the honor of presenting these views sixty years ago, before this honorable body, as the record will attest."

Visible speech deals with sound. Its symbols represent the actual formation of sound. The blowing of the wind, songs of birds, cries of animals, human cries, from the most primitive expressions of feeling to formulated speech. The pronunciation of language from its dialects to the last refinement of educated speech,—all are in this science of universal alphabetics.

However language may change, visible speech can record it accurately, past, present and to come.

The fundamental principle of visible speech is that all relations of sound are symbolized by relations of form. Each organ and each mode of organic action concerned in the production or modification of sound has its appropriate symbol, and all sounds of the same nature produced at different parts of the mouth are represented by a single sym-

bol, turned in a direction corresponding to the organic position.

The student who masters visible speech gains control of the apparatus of speech; viz., the lungs, diaphragm, glottis, pharynx, soft palate, tongue and lips, for he must be able to use each organ of speech in a definite and specified way, in order to produce with accuracy the various sounds therein symbolized. His ear becomes trained to a nicety, through effort to discriminate these sounds.

The perfect production of the sounds therein symbolized requires a definite, directed and focused emission of both breath and tone, in their passage through the tone cavities.

The soft palate should completely cover the inner ends of the nares, except in forming nasal sounds. There are three nasal sounds in English, "m," "n" and "ng," all consonants. Vowels are never to be nasalized in English. The French language has four nasal vowels. (Illustrations.) The office of the pharynx is a very important one. Its expansion gives expulsive force to final consonants, making them clear and distinct. (Illustrating.)

Obstruction of breath within the mouth expands the pharynx. Remove the obstruction and a percussion results. This exercise is a remedy for breathiness of tone.

Final consonants should never be given with emission of breath from the glottis.

The same principle applies to vowels.

The knowledge and application of it is the secret of force and power of tone. Singers call it holding back the tone. (Illustrating.) Good enunciation is the result of definite organic position and reaction from position. Loose adjustment and reaction produce a roll of tone merely. (Illustrating.)

All defects, such as lisping, nasality, the substitution of one element for another, burring, etc., and all impediments, such as stuttering, hesitation and spasmodic hesitation or stammering, may be removed by the application of its principles.

The vernacular, colloquial and vocabulary pronunciation of all languages may be attained by use of its symbols. (Illustrating.) Visible speech has also symbols for the production and regulation of accent, inflection, pitch, emphasis and the grouping of words. Through the knowledge and

practice of these symbolized exercises, the student gains facility of modulation and command of rhythm. The faithful student of this science acquires expertness in the mechanism of his art. The gift of expressing in voice or speech varieties of emotions and shades of mentality is rare. Bad elocution is not so much the result of imitation as of limitation.

Through the faithful study and practice of this science, —though Nature may have endowed him sparingly as to the gift of expression,—an elocutionist may become as valuable an exponent of his profession as is each member of a well-trained musical orchestra.

Speech is generally classified under two divisions: vowels and consonants. Visible speech adds to this division a table of glides, twelve in number—a table of modifiers, twenty-one in number. Glides are intermediate transitional sounds. The principal glides are indefinite sounds of “y,” “w” and “r.”

The simple voice glide is very common in some dialects. It is like a drawl. (Illustrating.)

The simple breath glide is characteristic of Irish utterance. It is an emission from the consonant position, and not from the throat, as “p(h)aper.” (Illustrating.) It differs from the aspirate “h,” but is coarsely imitated by interpolating an “h” between the elements, as in “p(h)aper” for “paper.”

The use of this breath glide in final syllables is one of the bugbears in teaching. It is variously designated as dropping at the end of the line, lack of voice placing, etc. Various directions are given for its correction, such as “lift your voice,” “don’t drop,” “keep it up,” etc. The trouble is the substitution of a breath glide for a voice glide in diphthongs, as “go,” “day,” “do.” (Illustrating.) Give instead the proper voice glide. That is, finish your sound in the glottis sharply, as “day,” “go,” “do” (illustrating), and the defect is overcome.

Of the modifiers we may note one which symbolizes a peculiarity of English utterance in the words “kind,” “guard,” “card,” “girl.” The use of the outer modifier shows that “k” and “g” are formed farther forward than normally. The ordinary representation of this effect (“keeind,” “kynd”) is an exaggeration; there is no “ee”

or "y" in the sound, but merely an anterior formation of "k" and "g."

Visible speech adds also four throat consonants:

Aspirate "h"—almost a silent breathing.

Throat Contracted=Whisper.

Throat Vocalized=Hoarseness.

The Catch=a stoppage of the breath by closing the throat—a cough.

This last is the *coup de la glotte*.

The perfection of its production gives what singers term "the attack of tone."

The normal alphabet of visible speech includes fifty-two consonants and thirty-six vowels, which may be indefinitely increased to denote slight differences in the formation of the elements. Added to these is a table of exercises or elemental sounds, which symbolizes every phase of dramatic expression. The teacher who has struggled to teach the sob, the laugh, the cry of pain, the threat, etc., through imitation or psychology, will heave a sigh of relief (which is also symbolized), and gladly use this mechanical, definite means to a dramatic end, thereby saving himself and his pupils many hours of toil and futile anguish.

Psychology enables us to analyze the effect of emotions upon the body and its organs. Visible speech symbolizes the result of those effects upon the organs of speech. This gives great advantage to the dramatic student. The production of impure qualities of tone, resulting from stress of emotion, does not injure the voice, because the adjustment of the organs for such production is then perfect. But the student is not under stress of emotion. In his futile efforts to throw himself into states of mind productive of given emotions, he strains his voice through maladjustment of the organs.

English visible speech is a record of the pronunciation of the educated class of English-speaking people. It gives not only the elements heard in accented syllables, but also those nice shades of variety heard in the unaccented syllables.

Were it adopted as a standard, we should have no more defense of provincial peculiarities. Let us glance for a moment at this table of English Visible Speech.

(The reader here ran over the table, illustrating orally.)

MR. HAWN: Some two years ago I was very much interested in having a little book placed in my hands by a student of my own, who said: "Read this; I think it is not new, possibly." This little volume was written by Dr. Silas S. Neff, president of the Neff College of Oratory, in Philadelphia. I am sure it would interest you, and I therefore now introduce to you Dr. Neff.

"TECHNIQUE IN READERS' ART."

DR. SILAS S. NEFF, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The subject given me is "Technique," but my real subject will be the "Philosophy of Technique," or the causes which produce it.

There is no difference of opinion, I suppose, among us, as to there being a very great need of something. If the function of elocution and oratory is to entertain, instruct, persuade people, and lift them to a higher plane of life and activity, I think we will all agree that there are very few public speakers who succeed in measuring up to this standard.

First of all, in evolving a method of teaching in elocution and oratory, it is vitally important that we realize fully certain fundamental principles, certain fundamental things which we dare not do; certain results which we dare not bring about in the student. The individuality of the student must not be perverted. If he come to the teacher in a natural condition, he must remain natural. If he come to the teacher in a growing state of mind, he must remain in that condition. If he be a natural, scientific, God-made man, he must remain such, and, on no account, and for no reason, must these factors be interfered with in the slightest degree. He must remain a human being. In other words, the teacher of elocution must have a sense of values. Some things are more important than others. There are some things more important than pronunciation, although pronunciation is very important. There are some things more important, very much more important, than articulation. For instance, sometimes it is better not to be heard at all than to be heard where you are unnatural in order to be heard.

There are two kinds of people in the world, having two

kinds of minds, producing two kinds of results, and living two kinds of lives. These two kinds of people are produced by two kinds of so-called education. There is one class of people—or one kind of mind—which knows only what it has learned. It is a memory mind; it is the mind that crammed in school. It is the mind that goes through life learning what it wishes to know, from books and other people, and incidentally learning a little by observation. This kind of mind lacks inspiration, spontaneity, originality, initiative, personality and individuality. A man possessing a mind like this works in everything he does; he never plays. God never intended us to work in the sense of drudgery (applause); but this individual is forced, by the very nature of his mind, to drudge in everything he does, and for two reasons; first, because he is deficient in originality, and, secondly, because he lacks the mental power which was intended by the Creator to do the work. God never meant you to work; He meant your feelings, as human steam, to do the work, and your feelings to be guided in their work by your imaginative power, and by your judgment.

The man of mere memory cannot work in this way, and so he is always compelled to do somebody's else job, to work for other people, and to do it as they wish it done. There is no inspiration in doing the other fellow's job. If you will go back to childhood, you will remember you loved to do things your way, and, when allowed to do them your way, you thought them play.

Education should produce the opposite kind of people, having sufficient imaginative power and sufficient feeling to remove all drudgery from their lives. (Applause.) That is the object of education, and that should be the object of the teacher of elocution.

This second class of people are the geniuses of the world. I suppose a genius sometimes works, by mistake, but, in general, he is a person who does not work, but plays at everything he does. This kind of mind knows much that it never learned, because, like the wheat field, it has much in it that it never took in, but it evolved what it possesses out of its own bosom. The second kind of mind is a growing mind. The main characteristic of such a brain is not memory, but originality. It has memory, but it is a different kind of memory from that of the first class of people.

Its memory is vital, spontaneous, not merely verbal and abstract.

If the student who comes to the teacher of oratory or elocution has a dead, non-growing mind, it is the teacher's first duty to change his mind, because you cannot teach a dead mind elocution. You can teach him that unnatural sort which you all condemn, but you cannot teach him real, natural elocution. Such a student cannot be an elocutionist that anybody would want to hear. (Laughter and applause.) You can teach him a certain kind of so-called gesture, a certain kind of physical exercises; you can teach him articulation, and he can go out advertised to the world as having been taught gesture, articulation, etc.; but these things are not elocution. The teacher of elocution must never leave any marks of the tools upon the student. (Applause.) The public must never know that a man has studied elocution. It is a great deal better that the speaker be awkward than for him to show by his action or articulation that he studied elocution. It is asked, "Why, then, do we study elocution?" Here we come to this sense of values again. What do we study elocution for? Not to exhibit our tools, but to persuade the human soul. (Applause.)

One of the things that has brought elocution into disrepute is paying too much attention to certain things that are subordinate, and not in themselves as important as other things, and slighting other things almost infinitely more important. And some people are wise enough to believe that, if we solved the problems of rightly doing the things of great importance, such is the relation of these to the subordinate matters that the latter would not need our attention.

The orator speaks four languages, the language of sound, the language of articulate speech, the language of form, and the language of motion. When a human being is human, natural, these four languages all co-operate one with another, all act together harmoniously, none being pushed beyond the others. In the natural speaker the languages never attract the hearers' attention.

There are people whose voices are the most prominent thing about them; others whose pronunciation is the most prominent; still others, whose rhetoric, whose logic, whose body, whose gestures, are the most prominent. And none of these must be prominent. (Applause.) We look through

the transparent window at the trees, and the squirrels playing, and listen to the birds singing; and we do not think of the window pane, but of the birds and the squirrels. And thus the gestures, the voice, the language, the physical organism, must all be absolutely transparent.

There is a way of developing in each student the best that he is capable of, and at the same time retaining his naturalness, without special mechanical vocal exercises, without a special external teaching of gesture, or without teaching expression in any of its phases. Of course, he must speak, he must recite, or sing; and, in singing, reciting or speaking, and expressing himself in a natural way, not only the voice, but the muscles of the face, of the throat—the fingers, the whole body, and the articulation—all get their physical gymnastics at one time in perfect harmony, without any danger of one of the languages being pushed out of harmony with the others. But such practice alone will not develop great power. Something else is necessary.

There have been three remedies tried for the evolution or production of orators, public speakers, elocutionists, actors, musicians, writers.

The first is the remedy of Inspiration—speak as you feel, and get into the spirit of what you say.

The second is the remedy of Education.

The third is the remedy of the teacher of Expression.

Any remedy works with the born genius; but the reputation of the teacher should rest, not on what he is supposed to have done for the genius, but on what he actually did for the ordinary student, who would never have succeeded but for his teacher.

The Inspiration theory works with the man who does not need it, with the man who has the inspiration and the mental power, the mental qualities, who is a born orator, and did not need to be told to enter into the spirit of what he said, because he was already there.

The remedy of Education is the remedy of cramming; and even cramming cannot kill great genius, but it is death to the ordinary man.

The third remedy, teaching Expression, like the others, works with the genius, because the genius does not need it. Expression can no more be taught than you can teach roses or anything else how to grow. All living organisms grow in

their own way. But, while you cannot teach roses how to grow, if you go at it in the right way, you can marvelously aid them in their growth. You can surround them with better light, and fertilize the soil, but you cannot teach them how to grow. God put the "how to grow," how to manifest itself, in every germ in the world, in both mental and physical germs.

It is therefore wrong to tell a student to let the voice fall here; emphasize this word; or make this gesture, or that gesture; or use a particular tone of voice at such a place. It is as wrong as it would be for the ignorant florist to put artificial flowers on his bushes, instead of the right fertilizer in the soil. The attempted teaching of expression is wrong, because it destroys individuality, leaves the marks of the tools always, arrests mental growth, and kills manhood.

Each of these remedies has failed because they never increase power and always produce unnaturalness.

There is a fourth remedy, and it is not the remedy of Education from the standpoint of instruction, although there is instruction in it. It is not the remedy of teaching Expression, but it produces expression without teaching it. It is not the remedy of Inspiration, although it produces inspiration, and thus increases the power of the mind. And, to give it a name, I will call it the remedy of the New Mind Development.

There are two kinds of education. (I have already spoken of two kinds of people.) The kind of education which crams is one kind. To illustrate, suppose I use this sentence:

"This assembly hall has witnessed many interesting occasions."

There we have a sentence stating a fact. If I am to educate myself according to the first idea, I will go on learning as many facts as possible. I will read, and study books, and memorize in some way or other, as much information as possible. And, after I had covered a certain amount of ground in science, the classics, philosophy, and proven, by passing examinations, that I knew much that my teachers knew, I should be called an educated man. This is one kind of education, but it is not mind development. If that is all that can be done for the student, if that is all that can be done for the human mind, then the teacher of expres-

sion might seem to have the right of it. There is only one of two things that can be done for the student: either develop his mind, give him power, something to express—in other words, teach him to use his God-given power, greatly strengthen all the faculties of his mind and soul—or try to teach him to so express his few, weak, trivial, vague, insipid ideas as to deceive the audience, and make them think he has something to say, when he really has not. There is only one of two things to do. The alternative is Mind Development, or attempting to teach Expression.

Is it true that the man whose voice is monotonous, whose action is monotonous, who puts you to sleep in a monotonous way, who wearies you, and makes you feel that you would rather be anywhere than in his presence—is it true, I say, that his thought, his brain, his heart, his imagination, are all right; that he is a great genius; that he has an intellectual mind; that his ideas are as vivid as reality; that his feelings are as intense as human feelings can be? Is it possible that all this is true, and yet that he can stand before the audience and speak in that monotonous, tiresome sort of fashion? Is such a thing possible? You will all agree that it is not possible. It is false, then, to say that such a man understands and fully appreciates what he says; that his mind is all right; and that his only defect is lack of power to express himself; and that he needs the services of a teacher of Expression. But you say, such a man may be a college president. Yes, he may be a college president. And must we, therefore, on this account alone, assume that his mind is all right, and that therefore the thing he needs is not mind development, but the teaching of expression, voice culture, gesture, articulation, and so on? No; this is entirely false. The moment you apply the Expression remedy to such a man, you produce two defects where only one existed before; you have added unnaturalness to a peculiar kind of mental weakness. You must either change the man's inner mental life, or let him alone.

The question that is now before us is this: Has there been a missing link in education? Is there something that you can do, even for such a college president?

Ladies and gentlemen, you occupy the most fortunate position as teachers in the whole history of education. The teacher of science, language and philosophy and expression has no remedy. The case is utterly hopeless, unless you

go to the rescue, and help him out of that situation. (Applause.) He is there to remain, a nonentity as a force in the world, so far as his personality is concerned. He may be noted as a great philosopher, he may be a scientist, he may be a linguist, he may add to the knowledge of the world; but he will not increase the inspiration of the world. He will not remedy that greatest of all human needs, the power to overcome temptation. He will not increase the power of man to live a victorious moral life, to live an ever-growing, expanding, individual life, which will be a force wherever seen, wherever it comes in contact with other human beings.

Again, take the sentence: "This assembly room has witnessed many interesting occasions." Suppose we had a class in elocution. The students would all say, if you ask them, that they understand the sentence, and, from the standpoint of the dictionary, it would be true; but, from the standpoint of human life, and of the fully-developed mind, they do not fully understand the sentence. This would be proven by the way they read the sentence. They know what "assembly room" means, what "occasion" means, what "interesting" means, from the dictionary standpoint; but they do not know what "assembly room," what "occasion," what "interesting" mean, from the standpoint of the Board of Education, who actually experienced the fact stated by the sentence. Go back into the brain of a real, live member of this Board of Education that meets here, and take a diagnosis of what is there recorded as to what has occurred in this room; what impressions are there, what associations are there, what feelings, that have been produced on his brain in this room, and compare that condition with that of the young boy of seventeen years of age, who gets his idea of an assembly room from the dictionary. Compare the ordinary boy's definition of the word "mother," for example, with the definition that some of you hold in your minds to-day, and you begin to see what I mean.

Take the word "occasions," as applied to this idea; the average pupil in a class of elocution would not have the faintest idea, when you come to speak definitely, as to what the word "occasions" meant, as applied to this particular instance. There have been fortunes lost in this room; hearts broken; destinies decided; men and women have been

here lifted into the third heaven of human experience. Our seventeen-year-old pupil knows almost nothing about that. This is the condition we meet in a typical class in elocution, oratory, music, authorship. This sentence is not one thing, but two things. There is a fact here, and there are also ideas here. The boy understands the fact, but does not appreciate the ideas. Here is the defect in modern education. Teachers cram facts into the brain, but overlook the ideas which composed the facts. The mind is not developed to any great degree by taking in facts. The mind is developed—ninety-five per cent. of it—through the evolution of ideas.

There are five grades of ideas. First, in many people's minds, the ideas consist of nothing but images of words. These are the people who cram and work. A student whose ideas consist only of words will, of course, be monotonous, speak monotonously, do everything monotonously, walk monotonously, eat monotonously. These are grade five ideas. The fourth grade of ideas consists of abstract conceptions of thought, where there are no images in the mind. For instance, I say to you: "John Smith's house burned down last night at S—," and just at the moment you do not see the house, you have no image of it, and yet you get the fact. The ideas that most people get from books are of that sort.

The third grade of ideas consists of those which have become somewhat concrete in the brain, where the brain begins to image the ideas.

The second grade consists of ideas which are very vivid.

And the first grade—which I call Grade 1 Ideas—consists of the second grade of ideas properly connected by the law of association.

A student whose ideas are of the Grade 3 kind will have a certain form of vocal expression, a certain kind of gesture, a certain expression in general; but he will not be a great reader, speaker, singer, not a great worker in any line. He will be ordinary in all he does. The remedy is to change the Grade 3 idea into the Grade 1 idea, and do nothing whatever with the expression. Grade 3 ideas produce Grade 3 expression; and, when you change Grade 3 ideas to Grade 1, you have at the same time changed the Grade 3 expression to Grade 1. The individual who has Grade 2 ideas, but has not connected them, and therefore has not

yet made one of the most magnificent discoveries that any man ever makes for himself—the Law of Association—will have a certain kind of voice, and, in general, a Grade 2 expression, and he will not be the ideal speaker. If he is a public speaker, he will be very emotional, but will lack perspective, and reach no climax, because he can see only one idea at a time.

But the first grade man is a man whose ideas are not only as vivid as reality, but are all connected one with another, and he can see the beginning and the end of his train of ideas, in one magnificent panorama. He has perspective. He reaches a climax. He begins at the right place, and stops at the right time.

What, then, is a Grade 2 idea? A Grade 2 idea consists of a vivid mental impression of all the details, for example, of a dining-room—the odors, colors, shapes, dimensions, temperature, motions, location, relative positions, weight, roughness and smoothness, hardness and softness—of all the various articles. A Grade 2 idea is changed to a Grade 1 by applying to it all the different kinds of association.

Now, let me tell you that, if a student's idea lacks color, his voice will lack a certain element; if his idea lacks odor, his voice will lack another element. Where does expression come from? It comes from the vibrations that make up the ideas, and from the combination of ideas (thought) by association. Feeling is the result of the explosion of mental impressions. The quality of the voice depends on the grade of the ideas. Where does variety of expression come from? From a succession of different individualized ideas. A dining-room exploding in a man's brain produces a certain peculiar kind of expression, certain peculiar tones, etc. A parlor produces a different kind; the graveyard produces a different kind. We do not get a graveyard tone by telling the student to assume a graveyard voice, but by the evolution of an idea of a graveyard. To attempt to produce a graveyard tone without the graveyard idea is monstrous. Why? Because, if you attempt to produce a graveyard tone without the idea, you will not have a true graveyard tone, and you will not have the graveyard face, nor the graveyard attitude that always in the natural man accompany the graveyard tone.

The method, then, of the new mind development consists, first, in a systematic course of development of all the

powers of observation, because every student that will ever come to you will have to a greater or less degree defective ideas caused by defective observation. No student that ever came to you, probably, was fully developed in the sense impressions of sound, color, odor, touch, notion, etc., etc.

What will be the test of this observation stage of instruction? The ability to go out into another room, stand in a certain place, and take a five minutes' observation of the room, and then give a vivid description of the room. That is the test, and you need not worry about the voice, where the brain can do that.

The second stage consists in the development of the imagination. Imagination can do nothing, except it has material to work on. Imagination is dependent absolutely upon observation; and the second stage consists in the development of the imagination, and, following that, in the development of association of ideas.

It must here be understood that what might ordinarily be considered observation study, nature study, laboratory investigation, kindergarten and manual training, while in the right direction and all fine as far as they go, yet all combined do not furnish the remedy here demanded, do not nearly reach the standard of the new mind development.

What will be the results? I have no hesitation, ladies and gentlemen, in saying to you this morning, that the teacher of elocution who will adopt that plan of evolving the power of expression will have stolen a march on the educators of the world; will have performed a flank movement on college and high school education, and will take the students or graduates of colleges and theological seminaries who cannot preach (not one in ten of them can), and in the course of two, or possibly three, years will make natural preachers or public speakers of them, with no marks of the tools, because no external tools were used by the teacher. And that has been the dream and ambition of every educator since schools have been organized. The ability to do that will place the teacher of elocution, in the estimation of the public, above all the present teaching profession; and it will place you where you by right belong.

What will it mean to the students who come to you? A new life; a life of pleasure and spontaneity, instead of a life of drudgery. What else will it mean? That every student who goes through your hands will, sooner or later,

find the vocation he is best fitted to follow and become successful in it.

What will it mean to you financially? It will mean that every man or woman you meet will be a prospective pupil.

This is not a plan of instruction for the feeble-minded. The college president and the college professor need that kind of development just as much as you and I need it. It means that everybody—even old men up to fifty or sixty years of age—should become pupils, and will, if you can succeed in convincing them of what I have said to you this morning. (Applause.)

It means the elimination from your teaching of all drudgery, all mechanical work, excepting the teaching of pronunciation. It does away with all teaching of mechanical articulation, because articulation is the expression of the explosion of emotion—of ideas; it is not a mechanical thing. It places you not only among the real educators of the world, but it puts you in the forefront of the teaching profession—leaders in the new education. The mechanical teaching of expression is not education. You would then cease calling yourselves teachers of expression—God is the only teacher of expression—but would call yourselves educators—educators in oratory, elocution, etc.

I have merely touched on the great modern fact of the new mind development. My purpose is to show that it is the only solution of technique, that it opens the only field of work for you—a field so wonderful, so alluring, so necessary, that all else pales into relative insignificance. (Great applause.)

MR. HAWN: I have one or two announcements to make. I have asked Mr. Fulton, Mr. Rummell and Mrs. Flower to serve as the Nominating Committee.

First, I wish to take a few minutes of your time to say one word as to the excursion. The skies are clear, and I think we have no reason to fear rain for the afternoon. You understand that we are to be at the foot of Fiftieth Street and North River at 3.30 o'clock this afternoon. From most parts of this city it will take probably an hour to reach the foot of this street, because the Sixth Avenue car line is the nearest approach to it, and then there is quite a walk down Fiftieth Street. So please give yourselves plenty of time. I am told that I have alarmed you unnecessarily as to

the collation we are to serve, and it will be more solid than I had anticipated. And there will be good music on board, and plenty of room. There is still time for those who wish to secure the tickets, to see Mr. Vining. These tickets will be sold to you for the nominal price of \$1.00 for a guest, each member being entitled to one ticket. I have no other announcement to make.

Reading by the Secretary of communications, etc., received. Motion made and carried that a committee be appointed to express the thanks of the Association for congratulations received from friends who had entertained the Association during its convention in Chicago last year.

Secretary reads list of new members.

The President extends a welcome to the new members of the Association, active and associate.

On Wednesday afternoon and evening a sail up the Hudson and through Lower Bay was tendered to delegates and guests by the New York Teachers of Oratory and the New York State Association of Elocutionists.

Session of the Main Body.

Thursday, June 30, 10 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR.

MISS WHEELER: The subject of the paper for this period is put down as the forming of teachers for colleges and universities. I object to the title. I object to the narrowness which that implies. I object to the separating of one part of our work from another part, and labeling one part "Dramatic Art," and saying, "You have that, and we have nothing to do with it." But college and university work is another thing, and they have nothing to do with it. We are all teaching dramatic art, if we are teaching anything. It is impossible to read, to recite, to hold the attention of an audience without dramatic art. The cultivation of dramatic imagination is the beginning with a child, and we keep it up as long as we live. In one of the great pedagogic schools in this country the teacher begins with very little children, in dramatizing poems, and there is nothing in this world that a child so loves and takes to naturally as that very cultivation of dramatic imagination. And this seems to imply—this subject—that teachers in colleges and universities are to do one thing and teachers outside to do another thing. Now, if that is true, I want to know what we shall expect.

MR. KLEIN: On one of the pages of Dr. van Dyke's book, "The Master Passion," there is a little prayer that he makes to his Master, in which he says: "Keep me from caring more for art than for life." The theory is a very beautiful one. I do not believe that the training of teachers for colleges and academies means that those teachers are to do different things, but it means an absolutely different method of application. I went to a certain principal of one of our large schools of elocution and oratory, and I asked her: "What shall we do in such and such a condition which I had met in college?" and she confessed that the reasons for which her pupils came to her were so different from the

reasons for which students go to colleges and universities, that she was not in the best position to state what she would do. But I believe there is need in this Association that we give attention to methods by which we may appeal to many of these college students who do not want to work; who have no respect for elocution whatever; who come to it with a determined dislike for it; who make the statement that they will not take it until the faculty insist; who have come from district schools and simple village schools, and the high schools and normal schools, where the methods are never taught or practiced in this art. And we have a condition to meet which is absolutely different from the teachers who give their time to the probable teacher of elocution or dramatic art, and the teachers who give their time to the teaching of the art in schools of elocution, would have to meet; and any teacher who has taught in the public schools will realize that vast difference in the methods to be applied. And it seems to me one of the most practical things we could do, especially since there are a great number in this convention who do that sort of work, is to give a little more time to the methods of application in the academy and college and university.

MISS ALDRICH: When I used the word "entertaining" I meant especially along the lines of elocution, not technically; and it would be impossible to use the knowledge of technique with little children. You cannot do it in public, although the teachers might have the knowledge of visible speech. The child cannot be reached that way. But what I meant was that there has been nothing offered in this Convention that would be helpful to the teachers in the public schools.

MISS THOMPSON: I must answer that. I have applied the form of visible speech to children over 2 years of age, and to people 70 years of age. I have done this in the public school, and I have done it in the university, and in the special schools. I have done it everywhere.

MR. HAWN: I am glad to say that at 12 o'clock, in the Section "Methods of Teaching," we have a Question Box, conducted by Mr. R. I. Fulton, and we want to receive questions along this line.

MR. FULTON: I had it in mind that this was to be tomorrow; but, since it is to be this morning, let me ask you whether you are aware that there are two ways of conduct-

ing a Question Box. One is for the one who conducts to answer the question as fast as he can, and then throw it open to discussion before the Association. The other is to ask the question of the Association, and then let them answer it. Which way do you prefer?

MR. HAWN: The latter way. Those asking questions, please request replies from certain individuals. Of course, the chairman takes what part in a discussion he may please, and cuts them off, probably, to about two or three minutes each. But the answers to these questions must be brief. I would suggest that you conduct it along these lines.

MR. FULTON: I would like to suggest that, in asking a question, you state on the paper whom you would like to answer it.

MR. HAWN: I hope we shall now have the pleasure of listening to Mr. Wetzel. So far as I know, there has been no word received from Mr. Wetzel.

Mr. Wetzel was not in the hall.

MR. HAWN: Well, then, I shall ask Mr. Silvernail to give us his paper on "Action in Public Address." I do not want to make any excuse for Mr. Silvernail, but it is only just to him to say that he was telegraphed to at the last moment and asked to take part on our program. This confusion has resulted from the serious illness of Mr. Newens, the chairman of the Literary Committee, who wrote me he had fainted in his class-room. I could get no word from him after that for over four weeks, and despaired of his coming to New York, but he telegraphed me that he would be sure to be on hand. That accounts for the lapse here and there in the program; and Mr. Silvernail, at the last minute, agreed to fill in this space. I take pleasure in introducing to you Mr. Silvernail.

"ACTION IN PUBLIC ADDRESS."

MR. JOHN PHILLIPS SILVERNAIL, ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Mr. President and Fellow-Workers:

An interrogation point makes a good fish-hook. I have come from my favorite trout streams of the Catskills, to make a few casts with you in the pool of expression, and to offer to my younger brothers and sisters some suggestions

and thoughts that I have landed with this interrogative fish-hook during the past thirty years.

One criticism on the customary teaching of elocution in the past asserts that the instruction has often been too dogmatic and arbitrary and too much by imitation. To no department more than to gesture, does this criticism apply. It is, indeed, not until recently that any effort seems to have been made to bring the work to a philosophical and reasonable basis.

Perhaps the first effort to systematize the work of gesture which deserves recognition was that of Austin, early in the last century. For many years his "Chironomia" was almost the only work treating on this subject in a formal and systematic manner. The work shows great erudition and careful observation. Yet its arbitrary and unexplained dicta, its appeals to the memory in the use of illustrations, and its inculcation of merely dogmatic notions solely through imitation, made it a most laborious work to follow in the study of action.

Bacon's "Manual of Gesture," which is founded on Austin's larger work,—which is, indeed, almost an abbreviated plagiarism of it, except for the fact that credit is given—is open to the same charge of arbitrariness and lack of philosophical explanation.

The more recent effort of the great French teacher of dramatic expression, Delsarte, was the first real effort to bring oratorical and dramatic action to something like a rational system, and to show that every expressive attitude and gesture had a definite *raison d'être*." Our debt to Delsarte, great as it is, would have been still greater, could his instruction have been preserved to us in its simplicity, and free from the endless imposition, complication and refinement of extravagance and mannerism, which have been foisted upon the public by many of the conscienceless charlatans who have posed as exponents of Delsarte, until the greatest teacher of expression has been made sponsor for a mere ornamental society "fad."

The essential elements of Delsarte's philosophy of action, however, his "Eccentric, Concentric and Normal," his "Mental, Vital and Emotional," are like an "open sesame" to unbolt the secret treasure-houses of thought.

The work of the investigator who seeks to add something to the suggestions of the two great teachers men-

tioned, Austin and Delsarte, is fortunately simplified by the fact that very few things taught by either of them require contradiction. The work of the former, especially, needs to be completed by explanation, while that of the latter almost points the way to such supplementary suggestion as would make it nearly a complete system of analytical philosophy of expression.

This phrase naturally suggests the name of another worker in our field—or angler in our pool—whose most valuable and learned work ought not to be passed without recognition. Reference is, of course, intended to the “Synthetic Philosophy of Expression,” by the late Moses True Brown—an honored name in this Association. If one were to specify any defect in this work, it would be the “defect of its excellence,” for it might possibly be regarded as too recondite and elaborate to be available for class-room work. But the student of expression who pays himself the compliment of thoroughly mastering the author’s thought, even though he may not accept all his conclusions, will be led a long way toward the conviction that our art has at its center a science which pervades it to the very circumference.

But to our angling. Let us return for a moment to the “Chironomia.” Here stands Austin’s lone figure in knee buckles and long hose, at the center of an imaginary sphere, surrounded by intersecting circles, and projecting gestures toward every quarter of the universe. Among ourselves, with my fish-hook, the little interrogative “Why?” let us venture to disturb his serenity. “Why, Mr. Knee Buckles, do you make that gesture to the front?” “Because Mr. Austin told me to.”

“But, why did Mr. Austin tell you to?” “Because he says ‘emphasis’ and ‘direct address,’ and ‘present reference’ tend toward the front.”

“Why?” “Austin does not explain why.”

“Did you ever stop to think, Mr. Knee Buckles, that certain things tend toward the front in expression because a man’s eyes are in the front of his head?” “No; Mr. Austin never asked me to think about anything.”

“And why, Mr. Knee Buckles, do you make that other gesture at the side, instead of at the front?” “Because Austin says that things distant in time, or place, are located at the side.”

"Why?" "Austin never told me; but I suppose it must be because a man's eyes are not on the side of his head."

"Exactly, Mr. Knee Buckles. You are an apt pupil. It is on the principle 'out of sight, out of mind.' Why do you make that other gesture, half-way between the front and the side?"

"Because it partakes partly of present, and partly absent; partly specific personal reference, and partly general reference."

"Very good. And why did you make that other gesture, in the oblique-backward direction?" "To indicate remoteness in time or place."

"Did you not do that, also, because your eyes are in the front of your head?" "I suppose so."

"Well, Mr. Knee Buckles, you take to up-to-date suggestions so readily, let me ask you a few more questions. Why did you make that gesture with your right hand, instead of with your left?"

"Austin always did."

"Was Austin right-handed?" "As I remember, he was."

"Were not his right hand and arm stronger than his left?" "I suppose so."

"And more skillful?" "Yes."

"What is the Latin word for right hand?" "Dexter."

"Then, gestures involving the idea of dexterity, of strength, tend toward the right?" "Yes."

"And those of a complimentary nature, also?" "It would seem so."

"Exactly. Then, would gestures imitating weakness, or something uncomplimentary, or sinister, tend toward the left?" "I should think so. 'Sinister' is the Latin for 'left hand.'"

"And do you think, then, that these tendencies of gesture, toward the right hand, or toward the left, arise primarily from the fact that the race are right-handed?" "It certainly does look as if they might."

"Good for you, Mr. Knee Buckles. You beat Austin. You, at least, have some reason for the impulse that is in you. Take a seat, Mr. Knee Buckles. As Chairman of the Committee on Credentials, I declare you eligible for membership in the N. A. E."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, these may seem very simple suggestions. But why should not the philosophy of gesture be simple and easily understood? It should never be forgotten that, in addressing audiences, one appeals, not to specialists in the art of expression, but to men in the average, and gestures appeal both to the understanding and the intuition,—even more perhaps to intuition than to the understanding.

The people to whom we speak live in the same world in which we live, and they intuitively appreciate the same things that move us. Therefore, if there are certain definite tendencies in the expression of certain impulses and emotions, it must be because of certain definite reasons. What we want is a system of expression such as the Creator taught when He made man.

Our little interrogation point fish-hook has enabled us to catch some inkling as to the reasons why gestures may tend either to the right hand, or to the left, to the front, or to the rear.

Let us try a cast or two in another direction. The books tell us—the “Chironomia,” for one—that “emphasis” is given with a downward stroke. Why? *You* say (not Austin), that it is because one can strike harder downward than upward. Why? *You* say, because of the attraction of gravitation. Precisely! Singular, is it not, that Austin did not say so, too?

Let us stop a moment, to slip that fish, “gravitation,” into our creel. Perhaps the most important element in the differentiation of emotions lies just here, in the adjusting or determining of the upward or downward tendency in attitude and gesture. We may find that the principle governing these applies equally, through analogy and association at least, to “pitch” and “rate” of voice.

So far as I am aware, no writer or teacher has appealed formerly to the attraction of gravitation as constituting a factor in the province of expression.

Not to weary you with too much detail, or an elaborate discussion, let me give you the law as I have formulated it, and as I have used it with my classes for considerably more than a decade. It has both a subjective and an objective relation. The two tendencies may be somewhat loosely stated as follows:

Subjective strength conquers gravity.
Subjective weakness yields to gravity.
Objective strength allies itself to gravity.
Objective weakness is rejected by gravity.

This wording is too condensed and antithetic to be strictly accurate, especially in the second part, that applying to the objective tendency. But it will perhaps serve our present purpose.

Take the first proposition: "Subjective strength conquers gravity." You see it as an indication of health and buoyancy of spirits in the man who, with head erect, shoulders back, and chest to the front, stands or walks with a suggestion of elation, which seems to say, "I defy the pull of the planet to drag me down or retard my steps." How this exaltation of aspect appeals to our æsthetic sense! How our admiration goes out, and our feeling of satisfaction and exaltation kindles when we see, even in inanimate nature, an exhibition of this self-exalting power of life! Contrasted with the low, groveling, creeping, stunted, contorted forms of vegetation, what a sense of the grand, majestic and inspiring comes over one at sight of the trees of lofty growth, that seem to aspire and grow strong with a sense of pride at their ability to lift themselves superior to the downward drag of the earth's attraction!

And in the animal creation, too, how the same law of life, ennobling and inspiring, seems to picture itself in structure and formation! While on the one side we see illustrated the subjective weakness which yields to gravity in the plants and animals of low ambition and furtive nature, that creep, and crawl, and glide, and seem to love darkness rather than light, and to be of the earth earthy; on the other side, we see the nobler forms of life glorying in their strength and seeming by their very attitude, structure and movement, to exult because not upon them was the malediction pronounced: "Thou art cursed above every beast of the field. Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life."

How great the contrast between the groveling reptile and man, who walks erect, and turns his face to his Creator, as if conscious of an origin and destiny divine and immortal!

Yet, not only in nature, but in man himself, we can see

illustrated the generalization of the great apostle: "As is the earth, such are they also that are earthy; and, as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." One needs to have lived and observed but little to have noted both the geotropic and the heliotropic tendencies of human nature.

Now, when a man is filled, inspired, with a sense of mastery, well-being, life, health, energy, joy, pride, or any other cause of elation, with the lifting of his spirit, will come a corresponding elation of physique. And, in proportion as this feeling of uplift and exaltation leaves him, he will show a corresponding sag and listlessness and weakness of mien, as if he were but a clod held to the earth, and drawn down like a thing inanimate and without soul.

Good health stands erect and walks with firm, elastic step. Disease stoops and totters. Joy leaps up, and with upraised face and palm, seems to call on the heavens to note its gladness. Sorrow sits with head dejected, and the wings of the soul seem folded and drooping. What lifts the soul or spirit lifts the body with an upward tendency of attitude and gesture. What depresses the soul depresses the body, with a downward tendency of attitude and gesture. So we have youth and old age over against each other; joy and sorrow; strength and weakness; good health, ill health; pride, shame; courage, cowardice; life, death.

Take a concrete case. Soon after I began to appeal to this principle as an aid in explaining the dicta of the books, I was seeking to illustrate my meaning before a bright company of theological students. I said: "Here I stand, forty years old—more or less—head erect, shoulders back, front line stretched, my head as near heaven as I can get it, not conscious of a tooth or a toe, or an ache or a pain, saying by my very attitude that I defy the pull of the planet to drag me down, and every muscle of my strong, healthy body seeming to cry out, 'Subjective strength conquers gravity!' But just wait until I get to limping around on three legs, instead of two (walking with the aid of a cane), when, as Theodore Parker says, 'the lungs suck the breast of heaven with less powerful collapse;' when, with teeth all gone, eyes darkened, ears deafened, the bowed head and shrunken form and tottering gait seem to say: 'Pity the sorrows of a poor old man, whose trembling feet have borne him to your door' (illustrating);—then you shall see for yourselves that 'subjective weakness yields to gravity.'"

The next day I found on one of the seats of the chapel, where the lecture had been given, a half sheet of note paper covered all over on one side with clever sketches of members of the school in profile, and one or two snap-shots of the lecturer. On the other side was a full-length sketch of an old man, flat-chested, round-shouldered, hollow-eyed, nose and chin almost touching, not a hair 'twixt him and the sky, his "well-kept hose and pantaloons" a world too wide for his shrunk shanks, leaning on a cane, the perfect embodiment of senile weakness. Why, you could fairly see the picture tremble! Underneath were the words: "Poor old Silvernail—90 years."

So far from taking offense, I straightened to full stature with pride and satisfaction. I said to myself: "If that train of thought can be put on paper in that shape by a quick-witted student, it is a good thing to tie to, and I'll keep it." Subjective strength conquers gravity. Subjective weakness yields to gravity.

But there are other things which tend downward beside weakness; and others besides strength tend upward. Some years ago a friend of mine was superintendent of the Mint in Philadelphia. One day, when he was showing me through Uncle Sam's money mill, he pointed to a heap of gold bullion, bricks about six inches by twelve, and said: "You can have one of those. Put it in your pocket and take it along." Without any show of preparation, I filled my lungs to the waistband, braced my legs, stiffened my back muscles, took a good ready, and lifted the topmost brick with apparent ease. Much astonished, Mr. Burchard exclaimed: "Well, sir, you are a much stronger man than I took you for. Very few men can lift one of those. You seem to do it without any trouble." I knew it was gold, and solid, and that the planet had a partiality for a mass of precious metal like that. I knew then, and remind you now, that weight tends downward.

So, when a man is to put forth strength objectively, he would better borrow the pull of the planet to help him, instead of antagonizing it. Man as body is subjective to the laws of the physical universe. It is for this reason that emphasis, and suppressive action, and the whole sweep of downward gestures, take on sometimes the significance of force. On the other hand, the bits of paper that blow about the streets, the dried leaves and dust that the wind drives

hither and thither, the gases that float aloft, as by the spirit of repulsion, so that the balloon becomes the sure prophecy of the airship, the thistledown that listlessly floats on the summer zephyr,—these are reminders of the contempt the planet shows for the things which add neither to its mass, its weight, nor its worth.

Before such an audience, I am persuaded, little need be said by way of applying the principle to the analogies in the realm of expression. Thistledown sometimes floats through thought. Gas sometimes gets vocalized. Dust and dried leaves and waste paper sometimes clutter the avenues of speech. And such trivialities naturally suggest the fugitive flirt of the hand, and a tone of voice proportioned to the weight or worthlessness of the thought, and thus are suited "the word to the action, the action to the word."

Now, when you see a man alert and aroused, standing erect, right hand aloft, animation flushing his face, high purpose flashing from his eye,—you know that he is dominated by subjective energy. If, in addition, you see this man still standing erect, strike downward forcibly, to the front, you know that he is supplementing his own strength by the force the planet can lend him. This is the man dominant. He has conquered his enemy, and declares superiority to him by declaring superiority to the pull of the planet, or conquers him by making a catapult of himself, and asking the earth to launch the projectile.

But I am sure further illustration is unnecessary.

In closing, let me advise, in preparing for your public work, that you so plan it that the planet shall do it for you.

MRS. IRVING IN THE CHAIR.

MRS. IRVING: I understand that Mr. Wetzell is present. We shall be glad to have him come forward and give us his address on "Extempore Speech. Is It a Practical Subject?"

EXTEMPORE SPEECH. IS IT A PRACTICAL SUBJECT? CAN IT BE TAUGHT?

MR. J. W. WETZEL, YALE LAW SCHOOL, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Not long ago I heard a well-known actor advise a group of preparatory school boys to learn how to speak extempore.

He said: "Boys, it will save you from many embarrassments." As an illustration, he related an incident in his own experience.

He said: "I had been playing in a small town for several days, and had become well acquainted with most of the people." I had been told that, on the night of my last performance, I would be asked to make a speech. This, I thought, would be very nice indeed, and, now that I knew what was expected, I could arrange to be very much surprised and wholly unprepared to make an off-hand speech that would be a fine example of an extempore effort, and which would enable me to convince my many friends that I was an orator as well as an actor. Of course, I would not presume to write out and learn a speech for such an occasion, but I thought it all out. I had my speech all nicely arranged in my mind. It was to be short, but beautifully worded, and delivered in the most natural conversational style. Even the gestures were to be extempore, and the smiles.

"In my mind I began like this: 'Having been in your city for several days, and having had the pleasure of meeting many of you, and of enjoying your hospitality, I will not address you with the usual formality by saying "Ladies and Gentlemen," but "Friends."' "

"When I came out before the audience I said: 'Having been here for a long time, and having gotten acquainted with the most of you, and having seen you in your homes, I will not call you "Ladies and Gentlemen," but sincerely hope that I may be able to remember you as friends.' "

An elocutionist was once asked during the performance of an entertainment in which he was assisting, to announce a concert which was to be given by the English Hand-bell Ringers the following Tuesday evening. Delighted with the thought of appearing upon the platform to make a few off-hand remarks, he walked to the front in smiles and said: "Ladies and gentlemen, I have been requested to announce that the English Hand-bellers will ring a concert in this church next Tuesday evening."

Is it not true that actors and elocutionists are not usually good extemporizers? Their practice in public speaking has been largely in reciting the words of other people. They devote themselves largely to the art of expressing, and not thinking thought before an audience. The process of the mind in recalling words in which to put thought expression is entirely different from the process of thinking for the best thoughts, and the best words in which to put them, before an audience. In the incidents mentioned the memory of the actor and of the elocutionist responded as it had been required to in the previous exercises of the evening, by recalling words in which to put expression, but, as the arrangement of the words had not been well memorized, they were recalled and uttered somewhat out of their natural order. But, if the words and their proper arrangement into sentences had been so well memorized as to be perfectly recalled, their utterance would not have been extempore speech.

The old idea was that an extemporaneous speech was one made without having previously selected a theme, and without having given the subject any thought whatever. One young man in a Western city, after trying to make a speech in this way, and making a glorious failure of it, felt so disgraced that he went home and shot himself. Many young men have felt like doing the same thing after trying to make a speech before an audience in that way. Indeed, many young men have killed themselves for public speaking by a fatal endeavor of this kind. Nothing is so apt to overthrow confidence in one's self, as such an experience.

The new idea of extemporaneous speaking permits the speaker to think out his thought before going on to the platform. It permits him to read up thoroughly on the subject upon which he proposes to speak. It permits him to outline his theme and to write upon it as much as he pleases.

Dr. J. M. Buckley says: "If the speech be neither read nor recited, it is classed as extemporaneous." I should consider that an extemporaneous speech whose delivery, whose arrangement of words, sentences and paragraphs was entirely, or even partially, the result of the occasion, a speech in which there was no studied effort to recall words, or set phrase.

All great extemporaneous speeches have been the result of much previous thought, directly or indirectly, upon the subject discussed. It does not follow, however, that all the thought presented in such an effort has been previously thought out. Such a speech is frequently filled with thoughts born upon the impulse of the occasion, but these, I believe, are subordinate to those which have been previously discovered. They are often the side-lights which lend color and brilliancy. They are often the thoughts which most thrill the speaker and the audience. They are the joy of the extemporaneous speaker and the delight of his audience.

I believe that, as elocutionists, we do not enjoy half as much of this kind of thrill as we should. I believe it is even more inspiring than the kind we get out of the thought and emotion originated by other people.

No greater satisfaction or pleasure can come to a public speaker than that derived from good extempore speaking—the satisfaction of feeling that one has carefully thought out a subject, that he has done some original thinking, and has arrived at some original conclusions; the satisfaction of feeling that the effort made to know the subject thoroughly has resulted in the gain of a certain amount of real culture; the satisfaction of feeling that one has something new to say that his audience should know, something that has thrilled him, and with which he has a burning desire to thrill somebody else;—this is the kind of feeling that makes good oratory, the kind of inspiration that makes all who listen feel that there is something in the way a thing is said that makes it effective.

Having acquired the habit of a good extempore style, the speaker thinks more quickly and with greater acuteness before an audience than at his desk. He finds his thoughts coming to him beautifully garmented and with adequate delivery. This is the kind of public speaking that is most admired and sought after. Its superiority, when well done, is

always recognized by the jury, the congregation, the audience.

There was a time when many congregations,—particularly in the East,—required a manuscript pulpit, and some do even now. But I think, upon observation, you will find that the pulpits—East and West—that are occupied by preachers whose minds and hearts are so overflowing with the message they have to proclaim, that they must talk to their people directly, and not through a manuscript, are the pulpits not separated from the vestibule Sunday after Sunday by an inexcusable number of empty pews.

It is sometimes asked, Why are the Western preachers so frequently called to Eastern pulpits? One reason is that the Western preachers have been more largely required to *preach* to their congregations, and not to *read* to them. It is sometimes asked why so many Methodist preachers are called to the pulpits of other denominations. One reason, at least, is that the the Methodist Church has produced more extempore preachers than all the other churches combined. It is to be hoped that, for the good of humanity, the Church and the gospel, they will continue to educate preachers to *preach*, and not to *read*, their sermons.

But,—can extempore speaking be taught?

We must recognize, first of all, that the ability to speak extempore is a gift, a talent, which education does not give, but which it may or may not develop, or assist.

One may be very highly educated; he may possess all of the culture that it is possible to derive from travel and association, and yet be unable to express himself before an audience.

An untutored fisherman, living on the Maine coast, is a good extempore speaker. He reads his papers, he studies nature, he thinks. He can make a good speech on any subject with which he is familiar, that would instruct and entertain even an educated audience. He naturally possesses the speaking instinct, the ability to tell all he knows about a subject,—and just a little more. If he had gone to college, and had been unfortunate enough to have gotten into an academic atmosphere, such as is pre-eminently calculated to “freeze the genial current of the soul,” and which generates a kind of high-bred, self-satisfied disdain of heartiness and enthusiasm, leading one to care more for what Quintilian calls an “accurate exility,” than for force and

fervor of style, he would undoubtedly have turned out an absolute failure as a public speaker. But, if he had had the advantage of being educated in an institution where in harmony with the training of his mind and body, his talent for public speaking, his soul life, had been trained, he would undoubtedly have turned out to be such a speaker as the world is clamoring for upon every hand,—a speaker who can express himself forcibly and in a pleasing and scholarly manner, without being tied to his manuscript.

The teaching of the art—or, shall I say the habit—of extempore speaking presupposes that the student has had the advantage of a good preparatory course, which should have taught him to pronounce words correctly and distinctly, and to use the voice properly. This, however, is seldom the case. It is, therefore, necessary in most instances to begin by teaching the fundamentals of elocution. Students are allowed to complete even a college course without having had any training whatever in the fundamentals of correct speaking.

Is it any wonder that we have so many miserable speakers among our college graduates, when there is so small a premium placed upon excellence of the spoken word? Think of a culture course of our years which gives no required attention to the culture of the voice, through which is revealed largely the personality and culture of the individual! Think of students completing a college course in English and Rhetoric, before they manifest the ability to pronounce and articulate the words of that language intelligently! At the close of a four years' culture course, students are expected to appear upon the commencement platform and reveal through the art of the spoken word their acquired power and culture, although their training in this art has, more than likely, been limited to an optional course of one hour a week during the spring term of their senior year.

But, even though the student has been thoroughly taught the fundamentals of correct speaking, he may or may not be a good extempore speaker. He must continue to be taught and trained in the art of speaking. Some of these fundamentals may be acquired much as one acquires knowledge in any science, as philosophy; but that which follows must be acquired just as one acquires skill in any

art, by practice, and by the development of the particular artistic instinct in question.

I should say, therefore, that extempore speaking is a practical subject to teach. I should place as the first essential in teaching it the training of the student in the fundamentals of correct vocalization and pronunciation of the English language; and, secondly, the development of the elocutionary instinct. Such training, of course, must be based upon the supposition that the student has a good mind and has something to say.

How to develop the elocutionary instinct is a broad proposition, and one which I need not discuss in this connection, and especially before a Convention of Elocutionists.

The reason why we have so much poor interpretation of thought with or without manuscript, the reason why we have so much ineffective delivery, is because the elocutionary instinct has not been well developed. A well-trained elocutionary instinct will not permit poor interpretation of thought. It will not permit inexpressive and ungainly gesture, nor peculiar inflections, and "preachers' slides." The men, who talk extempore have no time to think of these things. They must be governed by his elocutionary instinct. Rules and theories must be converted into habit. Then they are unseen, effective and artistic in the delivery of thought.

When Haydn was criticised for modulations as contrary to the principles of music, he replied: "I have put that passage there because it does well." Said the critic: "It is contrary to the rules." Haydn rejoined: "But it is the pleasantest." Haydn's musical instinct was better than his critic's musical rules. It was, however, an educated instinct.

In connection with the development of the elocutionary instinct the student should be taught how to read upon a subject upon which he may wish to speak. He should be taught the natural divisions of a speech, and how to outline it correctly.

He should be taught how to write on a subject, and encouraged to write constantly. He should then be taught to speak from an outline which he has memorized. He should be encouraged to do this daily to an imaginary audience.

Having learned how to make an extempore speech to an imaginary audience, the student should avail himself as fre-

quently as possible of the opportunity of speaking extempore to a real audience. The speaking before a real audience is the final and most effective training for the extempore speaker. There is no drill to be compared with it. The student must resolve not to be put down. He must look his audience squarely in the face and go ahead. The mental exhilaration will hold him up.

Carlyle says: "The public speaker is as the ass whom you took and cast headlong into the water." The water at first threatens to swallow him, but he finds, to his astonishment, that he can swim therein, that it is buoyant and bears him along. One sole condition is indispensable—audacity, vulgarly called "impudence." Our donkey must commit himself to his watery element, in free, daring, strike forth his four limbs from him, then shall he not drown and sink, but shoot gloriously forward, and swim, to the admiration of the bystanders. The ass, safe landed on the other bank, shakes his rough hide, wonder-struck, himself, at the faculty that lay in him, and waves joyfully his long ears. So, too, the public speaker; let him plunge in and make the effort—after being properly trained.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR.

MR. HAWN: We now have fifteen minutes for recitations for criticism. Will some one venture to recite for criticism? We need not confine ourselves to Browning or Shakespeare. I would suggest that some of the teachers who have brought their pupils with them have them recite for criticism.

MR. SILVERNAIL: I would like to ask whether Miss Magley is here. I would like to hear from her.

MR. HAWN: Miss Magley will recite for criticism. Her critics are Mr. Fulton, Miss Wheeler and myself. She will recite a little poem called "Good-Bye," in sixteen lines.

Miss Magley recited the poem.

MR. FULTON: I suppose this will not be understood as representing Dr. Wetzel's ideas of extempore speech. There was not time enough to get my thoughts together, or to prepare that speech which he tells us is so admirable when prepared.

The selection was one of those beautiful little tales of human nature, which the reader gave fairly well to those of us who were near. The criticism I have to make is this: That your work was too concentric, too much within. The feeling was there, but it did not come out. It did not go over the footlights, you might say. The impersonation over-rode the mechanical part of putting the sound waves out to your audience; there was not voice enough. Can you soliloquize on a large scale? In soliloquy you are oblivious of an audience, to be sure, but what actor would soliloquize in silence? His words must be heard. Then the main criticism, from my standpoint, is that it was too concentric, not eccentric enough. If I could multiply what you did by four, it would have been a capital piece of work.

MISS WHEELER: I find it difficult to give an adequate suggestion of what I want to say. The suggestion of the dramatic imagination was very good; the personality was very agreeable; the selection held the attention well. If I can say what I thought it lacked, it is poise, ripeness, experience,—which we cannot have in a speaker so young, perhaps. There was a certain effort at the surface, which did not give us a complete sense of power or repose. That does not conflict with what the previous speaker said about giving herself more to the audience. But that strength in repose gives more power to project the voice, gives more mastery of the voice, more power, with less effort; but I believe that is acquired only by ripeness, and long years of study.

MR. HAWN: The great objection to that kind of selection is that it is not fit for interpretation in certain audiences; in large places it does not lend itself at all to impersonation. I can think of no greater fault in our art than to take a little piece of soliloquy written for a male being, and have a pretty, charming, attractive young woman get up and victimize it. It amounts to that always. A woman's voice should always be like the lark's, ready to burst into music, and help the audience to imagine the picture. What did God give us the use of our eyes and ears for? To enjoy the perfection of the feminine face, the charms of the feminine voice. But when she attempts to impersonate a man, that is stepping out of one domain into another. This impersonation makes one of the many absurdities of this art of ours. It is mere technique. I hear the reader seem to say:

"I am not this man—cannot be this man. I am at your service with my voice, to read for you this little poem, and to help your imagination to make the picture."

MR. FULTON: May I ask a question of the last critic. Are we to understand that no man should take the part of a woman, and no woman should take the part of a man, in impersonation?

MR. HAWN: No man, excepting in burlesque, should impersonate a woman's part. Impersonation is not reading. And no woman should attempt to impersonate a man, if by impersonation you mean actually striving to get the real tone and manner of a male, because she only makes coarseness of it. I never heard a man who really got the actual woman's tone, and I have in mind one of the best readers in the country. It is a safe thing to confine yourself to the form of reading, or, at most, the recitation of ordinary works. But when you imitate the attitude, get-up, etc., you at once femininize what is meant to be a man. It is best for men not to impersonate women, except in burlesque.

MR. FULTON: What would you do in reading the letter scene from "Macbeth"?

MR. HAWN: He must recite the words of Lady Macbeth and glide almost imperceptibly into the impersonation of Macbeth. Lady Macbeth, in the sleep-walking scene, I should only suggest and not attempt to impersonate with my voice.

MR. SILVERNAIL: Is the question open for discussion?

MRS. IRVING: The time is confined to criticism of the poem read. I hope we shall have some interesting questions on that subject in the Question Box.

MR. HAWN: The time has about elapsed for criticism. We will turn this hour over to Mr. Fulton for the Question Box.

Thursday Evening, 8 o'clock

Recitals. "King Lear," Act 1, Scenes 3 and 4.

"Merchant of Venice," Act 1, Scene 3; Act 3, Scene 1.

MR. JOHN RUMMELL, Buffalo, N. Y.

Reading from Book of Job.

MRS. IDA BENFEY JUDD, New York City.

Recital. "Two Gentlemen of Kentucky," James Lane Allen.

MRS. WM. CALVIN CHILTON, Oxford, Miss.

Discussion Upon Papers Delivered During the Week.

Friday, July 1, 9.30 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR.

MR. HAWN: I am glad to announce that Dr. Neff is present at this time, and we can begin the discussion of papers delivered during the week. To get this topic fairly started, I shall ask Dr. Neff to hold himself in readiness to respond to questions which may be put to him, as to his method, or theory of method.

MR. ABBOTT: I do not like to take up the time of this Convention, and I have a very kindly feeling toward this Association. But I want to say something in regard to the paper delivered by Dr. Neff, and that by Mr. Fulton. By the program I understood that we should hear a discourse on the "Technique in the Reader's Art," and I looked for technique, but I did not get any.

The conception of the speaker, his ideality, is not going to help my technique. It seems to me we have missed the mark somewhere. If I can get you to analyze,—that is

all I wish. We have missed the mark somewhere. We are here, it seems to me, as teachers of expression, and not teachers of ethics, or philosophy, or science. True, I must have the ideals; true, I must have the impression, or I cannot have expression. But, when I think of this paper on "Technique in the Reader's Art," I want to find out what tools the speaker uses. I know what I have to *know* in my work; but what have I to *use*, to bring out what I have within me? I am tenacious just because I wish to be informed as to his method. If we do not see anything, if there are no visible manifestations, then we should know what he does use.

When I heard this address on this subject I was looking for technique, and I did not get it. It seems to me we have taken a most pedagogical standpoint in our discussions. We have not gotten down to anything practical; and, until we do in this Convention, it seems to me we are going to miss the mark. We must realize that our art is the art of expression. As soon as we get that idea firmly fixed in our minds, we shall be able to do something. Speaking of expression, the doctor made this remark: "It is no wonder that college graduates, university presidents, normal school presidents, have no use for the teachers of expression. Why? Because the teachers of expression do not teach expression. The teacher of expression comes in, and does not know, generally speaking, how to teach expression and sentiment. He tries to teach English, history, ethics, philosophy, metaphysics; and what the college professor wants is something that is going to help him and help the students in his school. He wants someone who will make him *feel* something in vocal expression and sound, that is what he wants. The college professors and presidents who, when listening to a man speaking, see by his action, something in his pantomime, that he feels what he is saying, and they want someone to teach them how to show this. The college professors and presidents know really as much about psychology and metaphysics as you or I know, and a great deal more. But they want some one to teach them expression, and we do that."

Now, let us get down to the facts. We are somewhere in a maze, and we must get down to fundamental principles.

I was very much pleased to hear Dr. Neff give his speech, but I would have liked technique in visible speech; I would

like to have received some points; I want to know what you use, what kind of tools; what is your technique? That is the point I want.

MR. HARTLEY: Just a word about this paper and this Convention. I have not been an elocutionist for twenty years. I have simply met an occasional elocutionist. But I do know something about it, and I have been very much impressed with the variety of teaching I have heard here. Going out from here now, the feeling is that it might be an eclectic system of teaching could be had, from what we have heard; every word has struck good and true, as I have gathered the truth from them. I did think something had been lost in the study, in the drudgery of elocutionary work. I could not hear; I felt that the articulation had been neglected. There were only four of five whose every word could be heard. That was largely the fault of the acoustics. But it is a matter of voice also. I have heard something said about bringing down the register in our American women. This should be emphasized more than it has been.

I realize that perhaps we do not give enough thought to what is necessary for a foundation for this work of ours. It is so true that we must get *one* impression of things, the main thought; and I gathered here that there must be a complete picture. No amount of knowledge of details will help unless we have *one* view of a thing. I have been told for more than twenty years to study simplicity; but, in order to do that, in order to get this beautiful, complete picture that Dr. Neff talks about, there must be mechanical drill first. It is impossible not to have that. If enough mental thought were given in reading,—the vocal training goes through reading just as much as it does through vocal exercises,—if we could teach articulation just as thoroughly without any special exercises, then it would seem to me complete.

But there certainly must be something as a foundation before we can get to that great elevation of simplicity that we want. I appreciate what I heard from Dr. Neff, but I would like to get something about that grand mission of the teacher of elocution.

MISS RAMSAY: I think the positive part of what Dr. Neff said was more than good and true, most inspiring. But the latter part,—if any of us believe in certain principles of elocution, I do not see that his words are true. I under-

stood him to say he did not believe in the teaching of any vocal exercises, excepting pronunciation.

MRS. HADLEY: Dr. Neff must feel complimented, at least. He has left us a great deal to think about. But I cannot help thinking that, if we took ex-President Mackay's magnificent principles, and then Dr. Neff's beautiful thoughts, and combined them, we could not fail to have perfection. (Prolonged applause.)

MISS ELLWELL: There is just a question that I hoped Dr. Neff would touch upon, which I want to ask here. As he talked I could not but think what trouble it would be if each individual child whom he had under his care had to be developed in ordinary speech. But I cannot conceive how he and his teachers can handle classes with this method, or do anything but take each individual separately, and that would certainly be very difficult.

MR. FULTON: Perhaps a word from me on my position will obviate the necessity for any discussion of my paper, given on Wednesday in Section I, Methods of Teaching, and therefore I beg to speak for a moment on Dr. Neff's paper.

I believe you cannot find any conflict between Dr. Neff's ideas and those of my rambling talk. He was showing the spiritual side of expression; I was trying to show the technical side of expression. Dr. Neff had one hour, and I had twenty minutes, which was not sufficient time in which to show the technique of expression.

If you will consult the report of the Convention in Chicago, you will find there an outline of principles which I explained in an hour's talk. All I meant to do was to supplement the splendid work of Dr. Neff by showing you that the other side was also necessary. This being true, there is no necessity for any further discussion of the matter.

In colleges we are obliged to submit to a course of study which a committee of the faculty will recognize as of sufficient strength to fit in a recognized scheme of education. In putting in this course I was obliged to submit a system of work that educated people would accept as a suitable mental training in a college curriculum. For this course our university gives credit for every hour in the course. Indeed, we consider it of such importance that, of the 182 hours necessary for an A.B., B.L., or B.S. degree in the undergraduate work of the college, the course in elocution

and oratory counts 45 hours of that degree. Now stop and think of that for a moment, and then talk about not valuing elocution!

MISS OSTRANDER: I come from the same State that Dr. Fulton, of Ohio, comes from. I have been associated with the Ohio College for seven years. After having been there three years, I found it was necessary, or advisable, to change the course every two to four years. My reason was that every pupil came into the school with an idea that elocution was a very easy subject, and that she could take a two-years' course and thereby get a diploma from college in two years.

I found that the faculty of that college looked upon this subject with contempt. I went before the Board of Directors and told them that this had to be changed. They immediately went to work with me and made a four years' course. Now, the elocution course requires just as long a time for graduation as the English, scientific or the upper courses, and every pupil who graduates from my department now takes a college diploma as well. And I think that, if every school of oratory would demand just that grade of scholarship, we should have much better elocutionists in our country than we have to-day.

How can you expect a pupil to *express* that which cannot be *impressed*? If a mind is undeveloped, how can we expect to get expression from that undeveloped mind? Hundreds who come to me and read anything from Browning want to know "What do you think of it?" after having studied it for perhaps a week or two. I have them give a selection, and then ask: "What do you get from it?" One young lady came to me three years ago and said: "Miss Ostrander, I can't get anything out of 'A Blot in the 'Scutcheon'; I cannot tell you the story; I cannot interpret it. Perhaps if you translate it for me, I can." Now I do not have to translate for my girls, because they have a two-years' course in English literature, and another course in elocution, and are supposed to have two years in American literature before they have finished. Then, in school, we have psychology, logic, ethics, and they require a certain amount of Latin before they are admitted to the elocution course.

That seems to be our great fault,—our scholarship is not good enough; and, when that standard of scholarship is

raised, the standard of the elocutionist must and will be raised.

MR. HAWN: The remainder of this hour will now be given up to Dr. Neff, to reply to the little talks we have had.

DR. NEFF: Ladies and gentlemen, I have been trying to collect into a sort of synthetic condition the different points that have been made by my friends, and I just lay my paper down because I feel that I have repeated myself several times. If, however, there are yet other unanswered questions, I will stand up and explain my remarks further.

The point that impressed itself most strongly upon my mind was this: Mr. Abbott's remarks that, in listening to the address on Wednesday he was looking for technique, but did not find it; that I was booked to talk on technique, and did not talk on technique.

Suppose the gentleman had been asked at a convention of fruit growers, to talk on the green leaves, buds, and limbs of an apple tree; and, instead of talking on the buds, the green leaves, and the branches, etc.,—assuming that the convention intended him to talk about how to get the green leaves, etc.,—he talked about the chemical ingredients of the soil, and the kind of seed necessary, and the kind of climate and environment, and a few other things like that. (Applause.)

Now that was my understanding. If I had thought that the president intended me talk about the buds, and branches, and green leaves, I should have telegraphed that I did not know anything about that.

I do not know how the black soil is changed into the white lily, and I never met anybody that does know. I cannot make a white lily either, that is, out of white paper, or out of anything else, that I know of, except by planting a seed in the black soil and letting God and nature do the rest. That is all I know about the technique of the lily; that is all I know about the technique of apples, or anything else.

That was my understanding of what I was supposed to do. The difficulty is, as nearly as I can get at it (certainly if I had had three hours instead of one, as Brother Fulton says, then Brother Fulton would not have had any time, but the difficulty would have been worse than it is now). The difficulty seems to me this: We all recognize that there must be, or should be, perfect articulation, and perfect ges-

ture, and perfect vocal expression, and perfect facial expression, and whatever else there is; and that all the elements that go to make up that general expression, I suppose, are what some gentlemen would call "technique," and I have no objection to that term at all. But my point is this now, that every part, every element of this external technique must come organically from within the mind, and that it dare not be interfered with in the slightest degree from the outside. Who would ever think of trying to produce the green leaves or the apple by cutting it out of green paper, and fastening it on with wire? Nobody. But, if the green leaves are not there, then what are you going to do? There is no lack of life, no lack of light, but there is a mystery of some kind, and the technique of growing consists in understanding the causes which produce apples, etc. And so my understanding of the question is that technique of elocution is purely and solely (except pronunciation; that is a thing you must learn by imitation, must be taught), but all the rest of it, vocal expression, gesture, everything that you can see or hear in connection with the speaker, except pronunciation,—I say every part of that technique must be an organic growth from the soul of the speaker.

Now then, what is the technique of elocution? It is subjective, and not objective. It is within the mind of the pupil, and not on the outside, except so far as pronunciation is concerned; that you have to learn. No man of brains will teach you by spontaneous pronunciation the Italian language, and so with the English language, or any other language.

But that is not true of voice. The language is a human invention; voice is divine; any facial expression is divine, and not human; any gestures are divine, and grow just as trees grow. Let me be a little more explicit. I said the other day,—I ought not to have said it, but I did say it, and so I will repeat it,—my own private belief is that exercises such as we used to give become unnecessary when we have the mind developed to a sufficient degree; that vocal exercises for the purpose of curing ministers' sore throats become unnecessary when you know how to get a minister or clergyman into a natural state of mind, to begin with, and then consequently know how to cure his brain and mind, and all the rest of it. I say that, when that is all fulfilled to a sufficient degree, the voice takes care of itself. And,

since we are on the subject of schools and experiences, I suppose I might be pardoned for saying that every year we have from thirty to fifty clergymen in our school in Philadelphia, and nearly every one of them comes there for voice culture, and not a single one ever received vocal exercises in their colleges within the past eight years. We have a set of vocal exercises which I would like to sell, as we do not need it any more. All the time I once spent in vocal exercises I now spend in mental development; and so, instead of spending an hour in voice culture and getting certain physical results, we spend it in mental development, and get vocal results, facial results, mental results, articulation results, and every other old thing that I could mention,—but the time is up.

MR. HAWN: We started this work this morning some few minutes late, and it is therefore at your discretion to make up the time that we have missed by extending this some twelve minutes, I believe; and, if so, may I have the privilege of the floor for a few minutes?

MR. MACKAY: Before the president takes the floor, may I ask this one question? The last speaker says that he has vocal exercises to sell,—used them years ago, and is now ready to sell them. We do not wonder at it, because he has cultivated the voice by his vocal exercises, but now they are dull work, and he falls back on his mental science.

MR. HAWN: I have gotten just enough of Mr. Neff's admirable address and remarkable theory to wish to combat it, at least in part.

It seems to me that we have here an idea most deplorably "run riot." For the last few years the "Christian Science" idea and the "Mental Science" movement have had such vogue that what may fittingly be termed a deification of "Thought Force" has been so accepted by a certain class of minds, that their outlook amounts to a negation or denial *in toto* of the material universe. What we have just heard would, at the first investigation, seem to have a scientific application to the interpreter using *his own* thought and *his own* emotion, for here surely the "expression" is the direct result of genuine thinking, feeling, experiencing; but a second pondering upon this theory will show us that it is not dependable even where the speaker attempts to express—*SELF*. Clearly no amount of correct *thinking*, no in-

tensity of correct *feeling*, no vividness of imagination, will enable a dumb man to speak.

Logically we may follow this thought and contend likewise that "thinking," "feeling," "imagination," neither singly nor in combination, will of themselves enable a man with a speech defect, or with a small, piping, non-resonant voice, to express himself.

Thus the interpretation of real or genuine self-evolved thought and emotion is seen to be in part dependent upon so material a thing as human voice.

Does not the same obtain in the use of all bodily expression? As I understand the speaker's theory, it is like the assertion, often made, that the making of a table will depend *entirely* upon the clearness and beauty of the mental concept of the table in the mind of its designer. (In fact, if I remember correctly, some such statement has been made by the gentleman in a published treatise). Whether I misquote him or no, the address we have just heard smacks loudly of that idea; too much so for me to allow it to pass unchallenged or to review it with composure. No one in this audience would give me fifty cents for the most beautiful table I could mentally conceive, not if I had the making of it. In addition to a perfect mental concept of said table, I should certainly require such mundane things as plank, glue, varnish, saws, planes, screwdrivers, nails, brads, etc., etc. I must have my arms and fingers to do the work, and most emphatically arms and fingers *well trained* in the cabinet-maker's handicraft! (Applause.) The "new-mind-development" forsooth! Will it make a perfect table appear in a material form out of the nimbus of nowhere?

Now speech, voice, tone, gesture, all interpretive functions and implements are just as material as a wooden table. Speech in the science of physics falls under the head of acoustics, and as such has its well-formulated, unvarying laws, and this irrespective of *mind*.

I therefore beg my colleagues not to put too much faith in mind development, certainly not to the exclusion of body development as indicated by voice, pose, flexibility, grace, strength, etc. Thus, I contend that more, much more, than mind and its faculties is requisite for even self-interpretation; but most of us, in this profession, are called upon to interpret some other's thought (not our own) and this mind-development theory simply confronts us once more

with the old query as to whether we must *feel* this or that thought and emotion in order to interpret it. We must understand the thought surely; this is beyond cavil; but I contend that the *feeling* is a result of your correct *doing*. If you wait and depend upon feeling before the doing, you may wait until doomsday. Are you in reality the least bit murderous when interpreting a murder scene in literature or in the drama? On the contrary, how careful one must be *not* to cut the man you are supposed to slay. But enough of this old question. No one here doubts for a moment that we have taught this art too long and too exclusively by an imitative process; let us induce the student to think more, analyze values for himself; let us *arouse* his intelligence and his imagination. But keep this fact in mind; we cannot give him or transfer to him either intelligence or imagination. Mentality is a matter of amount of gray matter in the brain and of brain conformation; with these we are born, and science has shown us that we can do nothing to add to or subtract therefrom. It is impertinent to tell a man that you are going to give him a *new mind*, and an untruth; we can at the most help him to make the best use of the mind he has.

In this connection let me say that to give a "grave-yard tone without the grave-yard idea" may be "monstrous"; but it is no more so than to *have* the "grave-yard idea" and not to give the grave-yard tone. If, then, a man from a present grave-yard experience is controlled by the grave-yard idea, it may be fair enough to assume that, being normal, he will of himself use the grave-yard tone in expressing that grave-yard idea.

Now, even in deepest sympathy, I cannot *feel* the grave-yard idea of my best friend as I can my own sad experience; how much less, then, can I arouse my grave-yard concept from the printed page in a fictitious story! Here is a truth: the purposeful use of the grave-yard tone will help to intensify the grave-yard idea.

In this address under discussion we have heard no account taken of temperament; but I find that temperament refuses to be left out of our calculation. I would not say that because a speaker is inaudible or monotonous that he fails "to understand or to fully appreciate what he says."

I should conclude that he lacks the power of an expressive temperament; he wants voice, and most often is without

vocal or expressional *training*. I raise an objection to the speaker's use of the word "natural." He speaks of "developing each student in all ways of which he is capable and at the same time retaining his naturalness!" This great feat is desirable only in self-expression, but in art when a man has an audience to appraise his performance, the said audience is assembled for the special purpose of seeing how unlike himself—how much like some other man, he may be.

So, I beg of you, fellow-teachers and interpreters, not to put all of your hopes or to trust your careers upon the intervention of this new god, Mentality; but to keep your balance by facing the fact that this art has an "outside" and an "inside," and that they are mutually interdependent. Let us use "new mind development" by all means, but new voices and new bodies and new temperaments where the old fail to serve. (Applause.)

I close with a question. Why did the speaker exempt only the one element of speech from the non-mechanical teaching of this art, that of pronunciation?

MR. ABBOTT: Just one moment, in reference to the illustration given by Dr. Neff. If Dr. Neff had been asked by the Horticultural Association to talk upon the *means* for the production of leaves, buds, twigs, etc., I am very sure that Dr. Neff would not have talked upon ground or seeds. I am very sure those who listened to him would want to know the best ingredients to put around the trees, that the leaves and buds might be produced. That is what we want in our work. God has given us minds; no man can give mind; but the teacher can give you a correct method of expressing that mental impression; that is our business as teachers of expression. There is where our art comes in, and helps nature. Where nature leaves off art comes in.

MR. MACKAY: I do not expect to take up your time this morning. These talks are more interesting than anything I could say; but I think a great many of you know that I have said before this Convention in earlier days, that all art is of the earth, earthy, and man is of the earth, earthy. And I am sure that in saying this I show no disrespect to the Creator, because, when He made the earth, He pronounced all things of the earth, and all things were good. Why, then, should we forever be clamoring for the unattainable,—for that which no man has ever reached? Why not stay on the earth, cultivate the earth, and cultivate

those physical qualities, those mental qualities, which you have to develop?

The Supreme Power overrules all, and He made it all; but no man or woman will claim that speech is natural to man. It is a matter of organic projection, as one of the first necessities, and you know, from the definition of articulation, that articulation is a result of the action of the vocal organs in producing and projecting the elemental sounds of the language. And again, you know it is little else but imitation; it is action of the lips. While there is a great deal of mental work in this study, there must be muscle in it, and we have seen the absence of muscular action all throughout the Convention. When we came to passion, we had force and precision of articulation, of the articulating organs; but you must get down to the physical facts of this thing. In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the opening of the mouth means bad articulation, and worse pronunciation. It is a physical proposition. If you cut a man's vocal chords, he cannot express his mental impressions, no matter how fine they may be. I do not care how grand the mental force is, the articulating organs must be developed, cultivated, before the muscular action can project the mental conditions, can articulate words so they can be heard. You cannot do this unless you train the articulating organs as you would train the hands to play on the piano. Physical exercises are absolutely necessary for the projection of mental conditions. (Applause.)

I am satisfied that the course of the progress of this entire science or art is hindered by the use of terms which nobody can explain. What is "divine inspiration"? Inspiration in the breathing process; you take the breath into the lungs; that is inspiration. Now, if you breathe quickly, you quicken the circulation, and stimulate the nerves to action, and in that condition, you project sometimes beautiful thoughts, and then somebody says that is "inspiration." That is all bosh. Again, talk of "atmosphere," of the "atmosphere" of art. I have been in the theatrical business fifty years, and let me tell you what the atmosphere of art is—a pretty, a taking canvas, and it is in the air; that is the atmosphere of art in the theater. What do you mean by it? You mean simply this, that the person stands in the atmosphere of art, is influenced by the beautiful surroundings; perhaps the classical architecture or the mental en-

vironments give a man encouragement through the impressions which he receives of them. Why not say that at once—why say “atmosphere”? Why talk about temperament?

MR. MERTON: Yesterday a question was asked, and I think so many of us want help along the line of that question, I wonder whether I might give a little idea of my own on the subject. The question was: “How can self-consciousness be forgotten?” I think we all realize that no art can be brought to that state of perfection—or has been yet—where we have not found faults, where faults have not been found by someone. So, if we strive for perfection, when we stand before an audience,—this or any other,—we shall be confused. But, if we realize that no one of us is so perfect that no work can be so absolutely correct, but that someone will criticise, yet at the same time, if the critic be sincere, and appreciates that the speaker has something of merit in what he has to say,—if we realize that the majority of the people in the audience, or, if not the majority, some in the audience, are there to find good and not bad, in what is being said,—I think we can gain some confidence from that.

MR. HAWN: I move that Dr. Neff be given five minutes more, that we extend the time five minutes.

DR. NEFF: The first question that comes to my mind is this: The gentleman to my right puts the question in this way: “What are the ingredients which will produce apples, facial expression, etc.?” Mr. Mackay says we must remain upon the earth. Certain trees are produced from the soil of the earth. Ideas come from the earth. Mental impressions of sound, and color, and odor, and touch, and taste, and weight, and temperature,—those are the ingredients, fundamental and primary, which produce facial expression and voice. These are the ingredients which, introduced into the idea, produce the condition of vibration in the brain, and this vibration explodes when we describe these impressions, tell of them,—arousing the dormant impression into a mental image, producing feeling out of sound, and odor, and touch, and weight, and smell, etc. And, if you ask me, therefore, for the technique of expression, I answer that it consists in putting into the brain and mind all the elements which God intended must be put there in order to produce a complete idea.

A college president has “extension” of knowledge, but

not "intensity." He has his masses of ideas, but not intensity. He has many facts, but his facts lack thought. You ask almost any college president to get up before this audience, or any other, and articulate, and he will leave out thirteen of the sense impressions which go to make up an articulate. I say that that is the reason that man has no facial expression. Your logic is all right, but you lack feeling, imagination; you lack the color of ideas; that is what is the matter. Why is it a self-made man so often becomes a fine speaker, when a college-bred man so often fails? The reason is that a self-made man lives a simple life, and touches and reaches the heart and soul of nature, by working his way up, and so receiving in his brain that complexity of intellect which produces a complete idea. While he did not get very many ideas, what he did possess were very powerful, and when exploded in his brain, produced a powerful effect, because the vibration which exploded from his ideas brought into play powerful muscles, and produced a tone of voice which exactly expressed those ideas.

In regard to training, just the moment a student gets a new idea in his mind he expresses it. That is where his voice culture comes in. When he takes a selection and stands up before a class, and tells what he sees, that is vocal culture, voice culture, but not very intense, of course; his ideas are weak. But, in the course of a year he is able to say fifty times as much before that class as he was at the beginning, and consequently he will have fifty times more power in his voice. If he wishes to become an elocutionist, he will speak it; if he wishes to become a writer, he will write it; if a singer, he will sing it; if an actor, he will express it in that way, and that is really the physical part of the technique.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have run over our hour some twenty-eight minutes, and it is time for the next hour, unless the Convention wishes to extend the hour.

MR. ABBOTT: I move that the discussion be left open until the president is here to take up the next hour.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary tells me we have a good deal of business on hand, but there is still half an hour on the schedule. Of course, it is at your pleasure, if you see fit to do so, to lengthen this hour.

MRS. OBENDORF: Miss Le Row has consented to talk

five minutes, but if she would talk three hours, we would like to hear her.

MISS LE ROW: I would like to talk three hours, because my heart is so full with this subject which is of interest to us all.

I have given my entire life to the effort to increase the standard of this glorious profession, the greatest art in the world, as we can say in all reason. I have grown old in the service, and you can imagine how familiar I am with it; and there are many things which I would like to discuss and bring to the consideration of this Convention.

It is deplorable to anybody to think of the disloyalty to the profession, the contempt with which it is treated, and has been ever since we started this Convention; and I may take longer than the time granted to me to talk to you, as I have one or two thoughts which I would like to leave with you, as a result of my own experience. There is nothing in this country held in greater contempt among educated people than this science of elocution. It is a word for ridicule, and a butt of ridicule; and we shall never have a profession worthy the name, never have any outcome from it, or any permanent value, until we get rid of the irregularities and faults which have brought it so largely into disrepute, and not until our pupils, from the beginning of the child's entrance as a pupil, recognize the human voice as something of value, and recognize a systematic cultivation of language, a thing to be entertained scientifically and regularly.

As we stand to-day on a fundamental platform of our profession, we have absolutely nothing to stand for, and shall not have, until the public schools require that children shall be made to use their voices properly, to speak distinctly, to articulate properly; and until vocal work as such is recognized as being just as essential as English, or grammar, or arithmetic. And how we are to create that sentiment I do not know. I have never ceased in my efforts for word and tone, but it seems to me, as time goes by, that there is less and less prospect of this being recognized as it should be. We have no foundation for our art of expression. I love the art of expression. With the exception of a few private pupils, I have never been able to do anything in that line, to get them to use the words which express beautiful thoughts. I have been dealing with mature young men and women, and what I teach is English, grammar, the

simplest principles of pronunciation. I try to give these young men and women an idea of how to use the dictionary, and the grammar, and the rhetoric. There is something fundamental, and I think as teachers we should try hard to reach the foundation.

I thank you for your patience. I feel that I have imposed upon you, but felt that I was forced to do it.

MR. HUGHES: Might I ask one question of Dr. Neff? Assuming that a person who has a falsetto voice would aim to give a selection requiring deeper tones;—unless he has that voice cultivated, what will nature do for him, no matter what he feels of the selection before him, unless that voice be developed to the proper range?

DR. NEFF: If that falsetto voice be due to physical defect in the vocal chords, then a surgical operation will be necessary. But there are other causes; and, if this falsetto voice be due to nervousness, then the falsetto voice will gradually, through mental development, become deeper, if he persists, without any physical exercises whatever.

Session of the Main Body

Friday, July 1, 10 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR.

MRS. FRANCES CARTER: I move that a message of sympathy be sent to Mr. Adrian Newens, Chairman of the Literary Committee, from this society. He worked very hard over the plans for our program, and has been stricken down with a very serious illness for several weeks. I think he regrets very much that he was not able to complete the program, and to be here and carry it out.

The motion was carried.

The following reports of committees were then submitted:

Section 1. "Methods of Teaching." Miss Marie Ware Laughton, Chairman.

MISS LAUGHTON: I aimed to repeat the plan of work as laid out by the Committee upon Methods of Teaching,

which work was divided into three sections: "How to Develop Voice," "How to Develop Expression," and "How to Develop Pantomime." The work upon pantomime was omitted, and in its place the Question Box was taken.

On motion of Mr. Mackay, the report of the Chairman of Section 1, "Methods of Teaching," was received and accepted.

Section 2. "Interpretation." F. F. Mackay, Chairman.

MR. MACKAY: Mr. Chairman and President, I was not aware that the chairman is called upon to make any report. I thought that, probably, the President and the Association being present at the time the work is being done, was sufficient.

I would simply say, as a report, that the hours of interpretation were interesting. In the hours that we occupied, it was my hope that the technique of the modes of expression of thought, past and present, would be developed. But the work ran entirely into the metaphysical part of it, entirely into mental effect, rather than physical expression. So, too, with the matter of gesture. While we had a very complete discourse upon gesture in a general way, the gestures were not done, and the mode of making gestures was not explained sufficiently to be considered as instructive to a class.

It seems to me that the general composition of the papers and of the thought has been rather beyond the reach of the primitive condition in which this society really stands. Instead of talking about physical work, which aids expression, we talked about mental conditions, which do not make an extraneous effect, no matter how great mentality they can give to the brain, except through muscular action. And I was in hopes that that would be done each morning; but I did not find it so, Mr. President.

On motion, the report of the Chairman of Section 2, "Interpretation," was received and accepted.

Report of the Committee on Necrology. R. I. Fulton, Chairman.

MR. FULTON: I am glad to say that no member of this Association has died within the past year. We have been very healthy. So that your Committee on Necrology is very glad to report that the state of health of the Association is good, and I have no report to make, beyond the statement that we are well, thank God.

MR. MACKAY: I move that this report be accepted and printed in the Report of the Association, because, if it is known that this society is so very healthy, it may induce others to join it.

On motion of Mr. Mackay, the report of the Chairman of the Committee on Necrology was received and accepted.

MR. HAWN: There is a very important business matter to be brought up under the head of "Amendment." Miss Wheeler, will you please read that Fourth Amendment.

Miss Wheeler reads amendment, as follows:

"Mr. Hawn moved that Section 4 of the Constitution be amended, so as to read in third clause: Active members who entail loss of membership by non-payment of dues shall not be re-instated nor re-elected to membership, until after payment in full of all arrears. This ruling to be operative after the first meeting of the Board at the 1905 Convention."

MR. ABBOTT: It does not seem to me to be a question that needs very much discussion. It must be plain to everybody that, if we are to support this Association, we must pay our dues each year, even if we are not able to be present at each Convention.

On motion of Miss Nelke, the amendment was accepted.

MR. HAWN: Since the amendment was originally proposed, the Board of Directors has slightly changed and modified its wording. It applied only to active members. We realize that always at a large local Association there are people who would not necessarily care to pay dues when they are off in another section of the country. It applies only to active members. Moreover, we have extended the time limit. As originally made, the proposed amendment was to go into effect in the year 1904. It would then operate on January 1, 1905. But, as amended, it means that any active member, no matter how much in arrears, may, after paying all the arrears, be re-elected to membership up to the time immediately following the first meeting of the Board of Directors, or at our next Convention, in 1905. So, please spread that little news broadcast throughout the country.

Report of the Committee upon Pronunciation, Franklin H. Sargent, Chairman.

MR. SARGENT: The subject of Pronunciation itself seems to be a simple one; but, considering it in the light of the fact that this is part of our business, the matter of pronunciation certainly becomes a serious and important one,

one in which we should be experts in knowledge as well as in example.

MR. HAWN: We wish to be taxed with our sins in this respect.

MR. RUMMELL: What do you mean by being taxed? Simply because Mr. Sargent is a teacher of this subject? What is this, more than an expression of personal opinions? It means that the other party has his or her personal opinion, and then we have a long argument about what the standards of pronunciation are.

MR. HAWN: Some of us really want to be helped. I pronounced "fancy" with the long a. Mr. Putnam criticised me, and when I looked it up I found that I was wrong.

MR. SARGENT: I think you will acknowledge our past efforts in the Convention. Miss Thompson, certainly an expert, also said "fancy" (illustrating with long "a.") If I should criticise individually, I should criticise Miss Thompson for this, which I am very loath to do.

MR. HAWN: I will let that point go.

MR. MACKAY: If the committee reports individual faults, I shall have to call on each one to state the dictionary whence he derived his authority, and that will take up very much time. We will recognize them ourselves, if he will state them.

MR. SARGENT: No two of us are absolutely correct as to what is the right authority. It is a disgrace that we are not, and, following the example of our worthy President, I think I ought to say, because I believe it, that, in this matter of pronunciation, as in all matters that so strictly belong to our profession, I doubt whether a body of people of this number,—I won't say could be brought together, but—could easily be brought together, who would have more mispronunciations, more bad faults, more dialects, if I may say so, and more ignorance and inefficiency in the art which we teach (I include myself) than we so-called elocutionists.

Yet our pronunciation, I have no doubt, is an improvement on what it was three years ago, at the last Convention I attended. But some gentleman at that time emphasized this same uncertainty as to the sound of "a"; the same uncertainty in the pronunciation of the sound of "r"; the same tendency to nasality, almost universal; the same over-use of the sound "urh," which I heard discussed three years ago. There is the confusion of breath sounds with vocal

sounds, the over-use of the short "u" or "er" sound, the same over-use of the short "e," the use of the provincialisms. We can locate nearly everybody present by their pronunciation. There have been some cases where the excellence of the thought, the earnestness and sincerity, the conviction of the utterances, made us of the committee forget that we were to follow the mispronunciation. I am free to admit that this occurred in one case especially; but I had occasion afterwards to hear that speaker in discussion, and I must say that I could not find anything that seemed to me right, in pronunciation or any other technical matter. The vulgarisms, some of which were mentioned, were very noticeable, in "hand," "arms," and words of that description. "What" is a favorite pronunciation (illustrating with short "u").

Of course, that American way of giving our final syllables a blurred sound, as in "influence," is very undesirable. Miss Story has a list of words mispronounced during the Convention, and we would like to have her read them to us.

MISS STORY: Mr. President, I have here some words that were noted as being a little faulty in pronunciation. It was impossible to make a full list, but I give you some of them.

Miss Story read the list, giving first the correct pronunciation, and then the word as pronounced incorrectly in the Convention.

Detail	Collection	Child	Newspaper
Fancy	Asked	Institute	Influences
Phantom	Philosophy	Recognize	Profile
Hands	Nature	Command	Bargains
Wha(w)t	Plan	Apologize	Form
Absolutely	Education	Understand	Rather
Passa(h)ge	Force	Culture	Consumed
F(e)rward	New York	Heard	Multitude
Latin (Latn)	Quantity	Graduate	American
Person	Birds	Cemetery	
Combination	Element	Military	

On motion, the Report of the Chairman of the Committee on Pronunciation was received and accepted.

A MEMBER: I would like to say that this present year, if this meeting were properly represented at the National Convention of the National Educational Association, we

might come into closer relations with the educational world. If we cannot get the recognition we desire, we can at least make a very strenuous effort. I cannot see why we should not hold meetings in connection with that society.

MR. HAWN: That matter was discussed very carefully in the Board meeting, and it now has to have a report from that committee.

MISS ALDRICH: Perhaps it would be wise to review the work of the committee, before making a report of the present condition. It seems as if it were a permanent committee; at any rate, Mr. Trueblood, of Ann Arbor; Miss Bruot, of the Cleveland High School, and myself have been members of this committee for some years past. It began by Miss Bruot's going to Washington, seeing the Secretary, President and members of the National Educational Association, and from them securing the promise of time upon their general program.

The following year a paper was given upon that subject, but not by one of our own members. The next year, the Association met in Detroit. Two of us, at any rate, were there, and we took advantage of every opportunity given us to advance the cause of spoken English. We attended different sessions and sections, the Normal School Section, and the Department of English Section; and, wherever an opportunity was given for discussion, we would open the work. I remember that, in one of the meetings there, the subject was discussed, and they became so very much interested that they stayed until nearly 6 o'clock, when the session was supposed to be over at 4 o'clock. And one of the members said, in opening the meeting, that, if teachers of elocution could be found who would teach English practically, there would be a great demand for them. They needed college graduates, who could teach the spoken word in connection with the English. In fact, they all understood that this work of elocution must be taught in connection with and correlating with the English in the different schools, from the first year through the college.

One gentleman told his experience, and said that in one high school they had tried three teachers of elocution, but that, instead of being a success, it was a failure, because of lack of practicality; that, in other words, the recitation, instead of the spoken word, was taught.

The following year, which was two years ago in Minne-

apolis, we had the good fortune of being given a full hour on the general program, and Mr. Trueblood supported our work.

Last year I was the only member of this committee present in Boston. I did, as nearly as possible, just what I had done in Detroit. The work was represented, not by a regular member of our Association—although he teaches elocution, I believe—Professor Baker, of Harvard, who took on the general program a full hour for his paper, and spoke along the line of elocution and oratory. At that meeting I went before the Board of Directors of the National Educational Association, and, by the advice of Mr. Trueblood and Miss Bruot, and, with their knowledge, I presented to the Board a letter, asking what means might be taken to bring about a closer affiliation, not necessarily a loss of our identity, but a closer affiliation between the National Educational Association and the National Association of Elocutionists. This matter was opened up before the Board, I being present when the letter was read. At that time it was received favorably by most of those present, but, on motion of some one in the meeting, it was laid upon the table, with the promise that it should be brought up in the future, and that the Secretary would communicate with me. That is the last that I have heard of it. Nothing has been sent to me, and I have heard nothing from them. And I believe that there will be no representative of this Association at the Convention of the National Educational Association, which will meet this year at St. Louis, unless Miss Bruot is there; we have not heard from her, and we do not know.

On motion, the report of the Chairman of the Committee appointed to represent the Association at the National Educational Association was received and accepted.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS,

MR. JOHN P. SILVERNAIL, CHAIRMAN.

MR. SILVERNAIL: The Committee on Resolutions, in common with all who have attended this Thirteenth Annual Convention of the National Association of Elocutionists, have noted the general harmony and good fellowship which have characterized our sessions. Notwithstanding wide differences of opinion, your committee feel that the courtesy which has been manifested throughout the discussions

promises much for the future strength and success of the Association.

Your committee also feel that we owe more than merely formal thanks to all those who have contributed to the comfort, instruction and benefit of the delegates.

"Resolved, therefore, That the thanks of the Association be tendered to the Board of Education of the city of New York for their great courtesy in granting us the use of their admirable and commodious building;

"Resolved, That we tender hearty thanks to the Receiving Committee, for the painstaking and admirable manner in which they have welcomed us and administered to our comfort and pleasure;

"Resolved, That especial thanks be given to the New York Teachers of Oratory and the New York State Association of Elocutionists, for the delightful boat ride and generous refreshments furnished by them on Wednesday June 28th.

"While it is not customary to thank our officers and members of committees by name, your committee feel that, in the present instance, it would be less than just,—certainly less than generous,—not to recognize the work done by our retiring President. In consequence of sickness and other unavoidable causes, the work of preparation for this Convention has devolved in a large measure upon him. Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the hearty thanks of this Association be given to Mr. Henry Gaines Hawn, for the manner in which he has not only discharged the duties of his own office, but has assisted in completing the work of other officers, and of the various committees;

"Resolved, That we pledge ourselves anew to the work of advancing the cause of elocution, and that we especially seek to promote the harmony and extension of the National Association of Elocutionists."

On motion, the report of the Committee on Resolutions was received and accepted.

Election of Officers.

Friday, July 1, 12.00 a.m.

MR. SILVERNAIL IN THE CHAIR.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE.

To the National Association of Elocutionists:

Your Committee on Nominations begs leave to submit the following report:

For President—Robert I. Fulton, Delaware, O.

First Vice-President—Mrs. Frances Carter, New York City.

Second Vice-President—Miss Marie Ware Laughton, Boston, Mass.

Secretary—R. E. P. Kline, Ottawa, Kan.

Treasurer—Preston K. Dillenbeck, Kansas City, Mo.

For new members on the Board of Directors:

F. F. Mackay, New York City.

Miss Cora M. Wheeler, Utica, N. Y.

John P. Silvernail, Rochester, N. Y.

Henry Gaines Hawn, New York City.

Channing Rudd, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Elizabeth Irving, Toledo, O.

John Rummell, Buffalo, N. Y.

MONTAVILLE FLOWERS, Chairman.

On motion of Mr. F. F. Mackay, the report was received and placed before the Convention.

Upon motion, Mr. John Silvernail was elected Judge of Elections.

On motion of Mr. Mackay, the election of President was taken up, and the Secretary was directed to cast the ballot

of the Convention for the election of Mr. Robert I. Fulton, of Delaware, O., as President of the N. A. E. for the ensuing year.

The Secretary having so done, the unanimous election was announced.

On motion of Miss Patten, Mrs. Frances Carter, of New York City, was unanimously elected First Vice-President of the N. A. E. for the ensuing year.

On motion of Miss Story, Miss Marie Ware Laughton, of Boston, Mass., was unanimously elected Second Vice-President of the N. A. E. for the ensuing year.

On motion of Mr. F. F. Mackay, Mr. Preston K. Dillenbeck, of Kansas City, Mo., was unanimously elected Treasurer of the N. A. E. for the ensuing year.

On motion of Miss Nelke, Mr. R. E. P. Kline, of Ottawa, Kans., was unanimously elected Secretary of the N. A. E. for the ensuing year.

MR. SILVERNAIL: That finishes our list of officers. We will not proceed to the election of seven new members of the Board of Directors. The Judge of the Election will ask the chairman of the committee to read those seven names once more. (Mr. Flowers reads names.)

MR. MACKAY: I should like to decline the nomination in favor of some other more active person. I feel the honor, but I have been serving for the past twelve years, and it seems to me I ought to be relieved,—not that I wish to shirk duty, or avoid work; but I should be glad to let some of the younger men take my place.

MISS WHEELER: I move that we do not accept Mr. Mackay's declination, if we can in any way persuade him to remain on the Board.

MR. MACKAY: I withdraw my objection.

MISS ALDRICH: I move that there is a name which ought to be placed among the names on that list, but is not because of the modesty of the chairman of the Nominating Committee. This gentleman has served many, many times as chairman of the Nominating Committee, and it seems to me he deserves a place on that list. I therefore move that we place the name of Mr. M. Flowers on the list.

MR. SILVERNAIL: Shall the name of Mr. Flowers be placed on the list of the new members for the Board of Directors? That is the question before the house.

MR. FLOWERS: In making the nomination for the offi-

cers of an institution like this there are always certain principles of tradition which must be observed. It is true that I have been upon this Nominating Committee a number of times, covering a space of twelve years, and have become thoroughly familiar with the traditions which control it for motions. It is no simple task to properly select a set of officers, and in arranging the nominations this time I may say that the committee has been very competent and tactful in all matters announced to you. Everything has been done in a careful and serious manner. That committee has thought it best to leave my name off. It was proposed, but I thought best that my name should not be on the list of officers which this committee has presented to you. The officers selected by the committee are best fitted, from location, from experience, and from all the considerations of this Convention, to serve you efficiently and faithfully. I could not possibly accept the nomination with these conditions against it, and must absolutely withdraw my name, not because I do not wish to work, but I could serve you better by refusing the nomination. Therefore, with all kindness for the votes that have been given to me, I must ask that my name be dropped.

MR. SILVERNAIL: The gentleman's request seems peremptory. He has a right to be excused. Shall we accede to his request and excuse him from standing as a nominee?

On motion of Miss Story, the name of Mr. Fowers was withdrawn.

MR. SARGENT: Will you kindly explain as to the number of the Board of Directors? I do not understand the situation.

MR. FLOWERS: There are twenty-one in the Board of Directors, and there are seven to be elected to-day; and I understand that the Board of Directors organizes the Board of Trustees from these numbers. These seven must be elected.

MR. SILVERNAIL: You understand, we are electing members of the Board of Directors. The Board of Trustees has a more limited number; and seven must be elected now to fill vacancies in the Board of Directors.

On motion of Mr. Abbott, the ballot of the Convention was cast for the seven names who appeared upon the list as Board of Directors for the ensuing year. (Carried.)

MR. SILVERNAIL: That is all; that finishes the work of

this election. Is the President ready to take the gavel?

(Calls for Mr. Fulton to make a speech.)

MR. HAWN IN THE CHAIR.

MR. HAWN: In laying down the burdens of this office, you understand my friendliness in saying that I also lay down the honor with the burden. I want to make this confession: It is a post of great honor, coupled with arduous duty, very arduous work.

It has been peculiarly so during these last twelve months, owing to most unfortunate circumstances in getting out our program, which we have decreed should be issued sixty days before the meeting. The gentleman having charge in Chicago was seriously ill. The secretary of the Literary Committee, who worked so faithfully and so hard on into February, and was so enthusiastic about what he could do and was doing, was stricken ill in the midst of his work. And therefore the shortcomings of this Convention are to be laid at my own door; but, being only one individual, I could not possibly be in more places than I was at one time. The committee work—much of it—was thrown upon the President, without premeditation upon the part of those who had the work in charge.

I want to say that there has not been, so far as I know, the slightest friction in this Association,—as reaching my ears. We have certainly had the most courteous treatment of one another upon the floor of the Convention. That is not always true,—it does not always obtain. And therefore I am sure this lack of friction during the last two years is to be attributed to your patience rather than to any merit of my own, or to the possession of any specially tactful disposition. Appreciating that fact, I wish to thank you, individually and collectively, for the great courtesy with which you have received me in open Convention and in private conversation. And therefore it is with a feeling of deep gratitude, and with the very best wishes for the future,—my future being your future,—that I now hand the gavel to my successor, Mr. Robert I. Fulton.

(Introducing Mr. Fulton.) I wish you the same peaceful reign that has been my own.

MR. FULTON: In accepting this gavel at your hands, I feel I am following a worthy predecessor, one who has labored for the institution with a genuineness of purpose and

with a singleness of motive that have been effective; and, in receiving this gavel at your hands, sir, I wish to state before this body that I will follow in your own worthy footsteps. (Prolonged applause.)

I appreciate the courtesy of the retiring President in according me the opportunity to say something that should be impressed in this our last general meeting.

I wish to make an explanation. I come before you under peculiar circumstances. This honor has been tendered me twice before in open convention. I wish to explain why I declined these nominations. At our first meeting in Chicago I felt that we needed the stronger hand of a strong parliamentarian. I declined the nomination and took the occasion to nominate Mr. Mackay, who was re-elected not only that year, but for the year following. He carried us through the first critical period of our history. (Applause.) Mr. Mackay had made some just and necessary rulings which to some seemed harsh, but he did not shrink from duty. A president must sometimes make unpopular rulings. Mr. Mackay maintained his point, the strong hand prevailed, and a serious rupture in our ranks was averted. My second nomination came from the floor at Buffalo, when I was physically unable to accept the responsibility of the office, and I felt it my duty to decline a task which I could not fill at my best. It was not a careless putting aside of an honor, or a lack of appreciation of the generosity of my friends.

But to-day I accept this high honor at your hands. This time it comes to me upon the proposition of a plain duty which I dare not turn aside. Be assured that there are no selfish motives back of this acceptance. I claim the honor of serving you to the best of my ability. In this light this gavel represents the highest honor in the gift of the Association, and my gratitude is greater than I can express.

We are to hold our next Convention in Washington City, our national capital, where, I believe, we can obtain a truly national stamp upon this National Association of Elocutionists. (Applause.) It will be some inspiration to invite you to the public buildings and halls where Webster and a long line of great orators and statesmen have rung forth their stirring eloquence, and where we may be surrounded by that atmosphere in which the great political influences of our country center. I believe we can bring to

bear such influences upon our Association, meeting in this beautiful and historic city, that we shall take on new life, new knowledge, new success, and new recognition on the part of the press and the public. Such an end shall be my earnest endeavor.

There are three great interests represented in this Association: First, the interests of the elocutionist, the special school of expression, the professional reader, and the public entertainer and lecturer; second, the school and college interests, the teacher of philosophy of expression, debate and oratory, as a preparation for the practical arena of life; and third, the actor's interests, representing the great dramatic profession which "holds the mirror up to nature," and bodies forth the glorious history of the past in the vivid colorings and settings of the stage. All of these interests are combined in our Association, without any forbidding lines to separate the art of one from that of the others. We study a common art, the basic principles of which are the eternal laws of nature and expression. I believe that these three interests must be represented and worked out together in the future policy of this Association. (Applause.)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, in taking this gavel, witness that I make a resolution that the best of life, the best of loyalty, the best of determined effort that I can possibly command shall be put forth for the good of this Association. But a pledge on my part is only as "a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal" without a like pledge from you. No president can lead us to success except through your earnest effort and lofty aim. I want you to make a pledge with me to-day that you will come to Washington City, and join with the members of our Board of Directors in helping to bridge over what I confidently believe to be a crisis in the history of our beloved Association. Will you be there? (Prolonged applause, all standing.) If we can have such support and representation in Washington City, we shall succeed. I thank you heartily for your cordial reception.

MR. HAWN: The old Board of Directors will meet at 1 o'clock, at the close of this session.

MR. SILVERNAIL: As President of the New York State Association of Elocutionists, I want to get the ear of our State members, or those who live in New York City, to bespeak your interest and co-operation for the convention

that is to be held in Brooklyn next April. We omitted our convention this year to help the N. A. E. We did not want to kill New York with two conventions here, and did not want to kill the Buffalo Association by holding two; so we decided to adjourn our meeting until next year. Will all members of the N. A. E. who are also members of the State Association please remember that the State Association will meet in Brooklyn next spring, and do their best to help us have a successful and delightful time. Please bear in mind, all of you, to send in your names to the chairman of our Extension Committee, Miss Wheeler, and try to be there, so that we may have no difficulty in having a successful time at our convention in Brooklyn.

MR. HAWN: The report of the Committee for the Selection of a Place for Our Next Meeting will now be submitted by Mrs. Carter.

MRS. CARTER: You have all heard from Mr. Fulton that the Board voted to meet in Washington next year. I lay before you the invitations we have received from the different places in the country. I have a very pressing invitation from prominent people in Oregon, not only from officials, but from the leading elocutionists there. The writer begs me to tell you that it is your duty to go to the West.

Then we also have an invitation from Niagara Falls; also from Detroit. Toledo was ready to invite us, and welcome us with open arms, had not the Board thought it better for us to go to Washington.

MR. HAWN: Our Association will meet next year beginning on the last Monday in June. Any further business?

MR. MACKAY: I move that the recommendation of the Board, that we meet in Washington next year, be accepted.

The motion was put by the President, for meeting in Washington the ensuing year, and carried. Also a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Friday Evening, 8 o'clock.

Music. "Allemande and Gavotte" (D'Albert).

MISS HOWARD.

Recital. Two scenes from "My Lady's Ring."

(A comedy by Alice Brown.)

MISS KATHERINE JEWELL EVERTS, Boston, Mass.

Music. (a) Nocturne, (b) Valse (Chopin).

MISS HOWARD.

Recital. Original negro dialect monologues.

"When Honey Got Los'."

"Marse Willy."

MRS. MARTHA S. GIELOW, Greensboro, Ala.

Recital. Scene from "The Madness of Philip."

(Josephine Dodge Daskam.)

MRS. BELLE WATSON MELVILLE, Chicago, Ill.

PROCEEDINGS OF SECTIONS.

Section 1.—Methods of Teaching.

MISS MARIE WARE LAUGHTON, CHAIRMAN.

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1904.

MISS LAUGHTON: In commencing this Section, I wish to state the idea we had in arranging it. We have three periods given to us. The first we decided to use in the consideration of the subject, "How to Develop the Voice"; the second, "How to Develop Pantomime," and the third, "How to Develop Expression." We found it impossible to find any one who was willing to talk about how to develop pantomime, so we arranged the first and third periods, and left the second period for the Question Box. Your questions we will ask you to hand in early on the morning of Thursday. Mr. Fulton will take charge of that Section.

"HOW TO DEVELOP THE VOICE—VOICE EXERCISES."

MISS MARIE WARE LAUGHTON.

I think we all agree that there is unity and there is separateness in the exercises given for voice development. In order to express what we feel, what we see, what we realize, we must have a trained medium. The first section on the program is "How to Develop the Voice," and just for a few minutes I am going to speak to you upon voice exercises. You know, and I know, that we must express what we are, and what we are depends possibly upon three things, our own personality or what we start with—if we may put it that way; our environment, and what we strive to be.

In those very few minutes it is impossible to sketch a complete method and system, but I shall try to suggest to you some way (you may take exceptions to it, or you may agree with me) of training the voice. First, there is the sustaining of the tone—you may call it what you please, I call it that—the sustaining of the tone, how to hold it, how to make it obedient to you. There may be one, there may be fifty exercises. It is like the physician who in his books has such and such a remedy for such and such a disease, yet the giving of those remedies differ with his patients and with

his experience. And so it is with our exercises. First, the sustaining of the tone; second, the freedom of the tone; third, the placing of the tone. Where you would commence to teach one and, leaving it, commence to teach another depends, as I have said, upon the pupil. I think you will all agree with me in that it is the co-ordination of these that must be obtained. While teaching these, attention should also be given to the smoothness of the tone; along with this comes the extending of the register, or, if you do not speak of registers, the pitch. And the giving of different terms to express the same meaning is another point wherein I feel we are each and every one traveling the same road, although we may be approaching our goal by different paths.

We must travel in a circle, each one perhaps commencing at a different place, you at one point, I at another. And from our various places we give to each other.

One great point I follow in voice exercises is the training in the clearness of enunciation. How do we get it? Some one way and some another. The absolute placing of the vowel, just as clearly, just as concisely, just as definitely, as a singing teacher does. The consonant, its beginning, its end, and a combination of the two. It is a matter of ear, and it is a matter of feeling; that is, you must realize how it feels in your mouth when given correctly. You can feel your tone as well as hear it. The tone may be absolutely easy, clear, musical, all that you wish it to be, so far as the tone mechanism is concerned. But now the emotion comes in. What are you going to do? This is a great question—should we feel all the emotion we portray? When I feel depressed there is a restricted sensation here (pointing to the throat), and there are certain other physical conditions that come to us from emotion also. Now, am I going to allow that emotion to clutch my throat and squeeze my tone? Must I feel that emotion to express it?

I have my own theory, but I want yours. These are suggestive questions for you to discuss. As I said, every teacher has his own exercises that help him to get what he wants out of his pupils. The exchange of these theories is what we want.

Now, I leave it for your discussion, or, perhaps there is some question some one might wish to ask in regard to it that I can answer.

MR. JOSEPHS: I question whether it is advisable to first sustain the tone before we have a tone that is worth sustaining, before we have the correct tone. I may have misunderstood you as you enumerated these things, but I understood you to mean that sustaining the tone comes first.

MISS LAUGHTON: I may have said so, but what I meant to say and what I think I did say was that the three were so intermingled that it was hard to say which you would take first.

MR. JOSEPHS: I expressed myself as objecting to the principle of sustaining tones at the beginning, for the reason that if the tone is not correct we are acquiring faulty habits, and I think many of us suffered from that habit of speaking in a fixed quality without showing the life and pulsations and certain subtle changes of color, owing to this very practice. The sustained tone may be sustained for perhaps breath control, but—

MISS LAUGHTON: I'm afraid I have not made myself understood. By sustaining the tone I mean supporting it from the waist muscles. I was not referring to the holding of it upon one pitch.

MR. ABBOTT: I am going to ask the question whether or not it is wise for us to assign the so-called vocal exercises. You who are familiar with the system, the regular formula laid down by Mr. Bell, know that he believed in teaching how to do by *doing*, and I have come to the conclusion, after fifteen years' experience, that I can get much better results with my students from helping them, or encouraging them to help themselves, to say *things*, rather than to say the elements of things, because in the saying of *things* the saying of the elements is bound to enter in; and I find I can get the pupils to get the freedom of the tone, and keep the mind upon the quality, the clearness of the tones, in that way.

MR. SOPER: I find that it matters not how we flex the voice, if we have the proper emotion; if we have the proper feeling or emotion back of it, that is sufficient; if it does not obstruct the tone, the emotion, the proper motive, we get the results.

MISS NELKE: I feel that in these meetings we are called upon to give our own experience. In that way we can help each other more than by advancing theories. I was delighted to hear what Mr. Abbott had to say. I want to add a few words along that line. When I began to teach I used a great many vocal exercises. The great majority of them were worthless, perhaps, or more harmful than helpful. I think I can get along now with about five vocal exercises as such. The voice can be cultivated better through the imagination than by any exercises, although exercises used in connection with the imagination are helpful. I believe in so training the voice that, without one vocal exercise, it can be heard easily in a large hall,—without any vocal exercises,—by cultivating the imagination; but with the judicious use of exercises, if we combine them with the imagination, we can get the best results.

We should sustain the tone without using great stress upon

the placing of the tone forward, so there is no pain in the throat. A young woman came to me who had throat trouble, and talked away down here (pointing). She did not come to me to speak pieces, but to have that throat trouble remedied, that obstruction removed. First, I tried to get the tone forward to sustain, and then I tried the pronouncing of the letters "m" and "n."

I believe I most thoroughly agree that imagination, feeling, emotion, all should be back of the tone. I most thoroughly agree that one does not learn the exercise purely and simply as an exercise, but the practice for reading will have certain notes as exercises, whatever you may take it for. It may be to develop one thing; it may be to develop another; but that is exercise. Each one has his or her own exercises.

MISS LAUGHTON: Please remember that these topics will be brought up on Friday again. We do not wish to run over the time. The next paper on the program will be delivered by Miss Cora M. Wheeler, "The Training of the Speaking Voice."

"THE TRAINING OF THE SPEAKING VOICE."

MISS CORA M. WHEELER.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Convention: I take this to be an experience meeting. In this section work we ought to come just as close to one another as possible. All of us who have taught a few years have certain experiences that have been rich to us, and may be rich to others. We all have something to get and something to give. We who are on the platform are not here to teach you who are not on the platform. It is simply our turn to give our experiences, and the next time it will be your turn.

I have been asked to tell, as simply and as concisely as possible, how I teach voice development. Those of us who have taught five or ten years have probably changed our methods during that time. As I look back ten years, I find that I have eliminated some things and brought other things into the foreground, have changed the preparatory exercises I used to think so important, weeded them out, and brought them down to perhaps a very few principles. In some of this elimination I believe you will not agree with me,—and I hope you won't, for discussion is stimulating, and I want to hear this subject thoroughly thrashed out.

We all agree, probably, that the foundation of voice development is breath control. But, while the foundation is breath, I believe we should start on this work with less conscious effort. Sometimes we make too much of our breathing exercises at the begin-

ning, and the tendency is to over-blow, like the flute-player, who does not get any tone at all at first, gets nothing but breath.

My experience is,—and I have had both singers and speakers in the conservatory,—that at first pupils are simply filling themselves up with wind, like the frog who tried to be an ox; and they get so much breath that they cannot control it. There is too much talk about “active chest.” You cannot get your effort down here at the waist if you are all the time trying to brace up here at the upper chest. Let the chest be forward, but do not assume an unnatural position of the whole body in order to get ready to breathe.

A pupil sometimes comes to me from the singing teacher, saying, “What am I doing that is wrong? I try to control my breath; I cannot do it; I do not feel strong enough to do it.” It does not take a great amount of strength, if applied in the right way. I have been lately beginning with just the holding of the breath, not trying to take in as much breath as you can, but just holding it. Suppose that while you are quietly breathing I should say to you, “Hold”; the moment you hear that word “hold” you bring the muscles to bear in such a way as to get an instant control, and you should do it without undue effort. Make no preparation for it, but simply do it by the firm grip at the waist, with no tension elsewhere. There is a little feeling of pressing out against the belt in front.

Of course, it would take too long to elaborate all the suggestions and devices by which a teacher encourages her pupils to get the right idea, to work in harmony with nature, rather than in opposition to nature, in any way. I believe more and more that the hold should be low down, and “strength at the center, freedom at the surface” applies just as much to this as to gesture. (Applause.) But the moment we lose our poise, or get excited, we lose the firm hold which gives control. We do it here in this Convention. We get a little bit excited, and the first thing we know we are getting our voice right up there in the throat, where it ought not to be.

We should begin by getting the hold down low, and continue by keeping the hold down low. Therefore, I have changed my mind about giving articulation exercises, and I do not follow any exercises or methods which tend to exaggerate the consonant elements. I think I speak plainly, and my pupils do; but we try not to do anything that will bring the energy up here to the jaw and the throat. The vowel is the sustaining, the carrying element in the language. We are told that our language is harsh, principally because people so slight the open, flowing part of the word. The principal power of the word in oral expression is the vowel; we all

know that. Under certain abnormal conditions we use strongly-energized consonants, but not to express the higher emotions or the ideal condition of poise.

There should be no stopping of the flow of sound until it reaches the outside air. Here, in front of the mouth, is the point of delivery; here, at the diaphragm, the point of starting; and there should be no interruption anywhere along the road. Make a tunnel of the body, and let the tone come straight out. Now, to illustrate just for a moment, take this line: "In the quiet arms of grief." Did you hear that last word? "In the quiet arms of grief." Now, that line suggests relaxation, absence of effort, and how can you give that impression if the final "t" is brought out with exasperating distinctness? Let the tone flow through the whole phrase.

I have heard that elocutionists are sometimes accused of over-doing things. We must be careful about these consonant elements; for instance:

"Last-t night-t the nightingale woke me,
Last-t night-t when all was still;"

and hear how some excruciatingly distinct readers say:

"Rock-k me to sleep-p, mother, rock-k me to sleep-p."

That would wake up anybody!

Then, unless we get the right quality in the voice, we do not have the right modulation, because the voice won't play, unless it is properly used and placed. [Illustrating.] "By the heavens, he is free!" Now, if the speaker has not the power to let the voice come forward, it never will come out free. He cannot modulate it, because the voice cannot get up there without too much effort, so that it sounds forced and anything but free.

There is no time to enter upon the subject of placing. Suffice it to say that here, also, control must depend upon the power to support the voice by keeping the breath under and behind it, as it were, so that it cannot drop back into the throat.

MISS LAUGHTON: This paper is now open for your discussion. As no one seems ready, I might perhaps say that I agree most thoroughly with all the speaker has said as to holding the tone absolutely from the waist and diaphragm.

MR. SOPER: I cannot quite agree with the speaker in all respects. I have always found that the pupils will grasp the throat there (pointing). There are two points of contact, the throat point and the diaphragm, and both should be used.

MRS. HADLEY: I think that, the same as with a music teacher, the child or pupil may be susceptible to the impression, the emotion,

but you would not think of attempting to have expression on the piano without the fingers being trained, and I think the voice has to be developed in the same way.

MRS. DAVIS: The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Better take note of the voices that we can hear with perfect ease, and talk about the methods used by those speakers. Let us take note of the methods used by them.

MISS NELKE: But lest us be a little careful. There is such a thing as caution. If we resort to personalities, I think many of us would be ashamed of his own voice before this audience. I believe most of us have higher-pitched voices in this Convention than we would ever naturally have before our classes. I am perfectly calm before my class, but I am not perfectly calm in this Convention.

MR. LELAND: If we cannot keep our voices perfectly free from excitement, perfectly calm, before an audience such as this is, there must be something wrong. Is there not something wrong?

MRS. CARTER: I was just about to voice the sentiment, the remarks of Mr. Leland. We ought not to be so kind toward ourselves as to excuse ourselves before this Convention. We do set up our methods and ourselves as examples of the good and proper use of the voice, and I do not believe that our feelings before such an audience as this should be taken into consideration. We ought not to excuse ourselves for pitching our voices to such a height that they lose the music, the melody, of the tones.

To come back to Miss Wheeler's talk, I believe, as someone has said, that the vowels are the blood and the consonants the bones of the body. Now, is not one just as necessary as the other? You know, a singer, when he is practicing, takes several notes higher and several notes lower than the tones he takes when singing in public, to give him freedom in the tones that he does use in public. Then, why shall we not prepare ourselves in the same way to speak before an audience, practicing in private certain words and tones, so as to give us perfect ease and confidence when we do pronounce those words, do speak those tones before a public audience?

I think too much time is spent in the consideration as to what you would do with the voices that are impaired, almost totally impaired, when they first come to you. I have had so much experience along that line. They could not possibly begin sustaining the tone. I only ask them not to say a word for six weeks, excepting in my presence; to keep perfectly quiet; to get control of themselves; natural relaxation more than anything else. Some

have used only the throat, and have no power in the diaphragm. Then where shall we begin? With the breathing, then the voice placing? As for myself, I believe in the voice placing first. After you have your voice well placed, you have breath control; then you can go on with your exercise, developing the voice with the emotion, etc.

MISS WHEELER: I want to make one or two points here. One speaker said that the throat and the muscles of the waist should work in harmony, and therefore needed exercises apart from the breathing exercises. The vocal apparatus is very beautifully adjusted, and the only reason that it does not work sometimes, I believe, is because we interfere with it; and, if we will relax the interfering muscles, the throat will take care of itself. When we say "relax the throat" we do not mean to relax the throat itself, but to relax the interfering muscles.

Then, again, I would respectfully submit that, if the tone is "breathy" there is some fault with the tone, or in the voice. Of course, it is true that the consonants, the vowels, each have their equal places.

Why do we practice for so many things? It is because the tendency of our methods is to energize. I submit that we need to remember that, and that we relax to naturalize the voice. I submit that we need to work on the vowels simply for ballast; we need to use them simply for ballast.

MRS. CARTER: Please remember that this topic comes up for discussion on Friday.

(Adjourned.)

MISS MARIE WARE LAUGHTON, CHAIRMAN.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1904.—12 to 1 P.M.

MISS LAUGHTON: Under the section methods of teaching, we have our second division devoted to the development of expression. Mr. Robert I. Fulton, of Delaware, O., will speak upon the "Principles of Vocal Expression."

"PRINCIPLES OF VOCAL EXPRESSION."

ROBERT I. FULTON, DELAWARE, O.

Ladies and Gentlemen:--It has been said by an orator that "the oldest question is ever the newest question." We have before us to-day the old question of how to develop expression, and you

have assigned me a particular part of that subject, the "Principles of Vocal Expression."

I think you will agree with me that there are three objects which we are all trying to attain in the acquirement of the art. First, the development of individuality in our pupils. The elocution which suppresses the individual is false elocution; that which encourages individuality can never do the student any harm, provided we distinguish between real individuality and bad mannerisms and habits which the individual may have acquired since he was three years of age.

A second object of the study of elocution is to correct bad habits of voice and action, and to put in their places good habits of voice and action. The best way to eradicate any sin is to put a virtue in its place; I think you will accept this as good theology as well as good pedagogy. It is not fair to rob a person of something he has confidence in, and then fail to fill the gap with something better.

The third aim is to prepare the body as a fit instrument to serve the mind and soul. Herein we have the problems of vocal and physical culture, and all the power of technical response of the whole body to the will and wish of the mind and soul. Can you think of anything beyond these three that the elocutionist ought to attempt?

To reach these results, some employ the method of technique only. On the other hand, there are those who say: "Get the thought, get the feeling, get the imagination, and the expression will take care of itself." Allow me to affirm that experience proves that this is not true. (Applause.) One of the most learned men I know to-day speaks so poorly that he actually puts his audience to sleep. It is necessary to have the technical power to express that which has been *impressed*. With a clear comprehension of the thought, and a full realization of the emotion, the speaker will be at his best, to be sure, but his best may be technically very bad, and his expression a failure. Let us be sensible in this, as in any other educational matters, and combine the two methods.

The principles of vocal expression are not new. They are as old as the hills, and as solid as the rock on which your city here is founded. They have always existed in nature, and are as true and vital to-day as when Demosthenes practiced on the sea-shore, or Sheridan's eloquence crowded Westminster Hall, some paying fifty guineas a seat to hear the dramatic orator. But only recently have these principles been so defined, classified and applied, that educators have recognized therein a philosophy of expression as defin-

ite and consistent as any of the philosophies found in the educational field. This philosophy is not only a valuable guide in the criticism of others, but a standard, a criterion, a philosophy of life by which the reader can work out his own salvation.

The foundation of this philosophy is the science of elocution. The elements or principles of this science are plainly and familiarly named. Let us be honest and call a spade a spade. The four great generic vocal elements in nature are Quality, Force, Pitch and Time. You cannot utter a thought or make an exclamation without using all of them, hence they are essential to all vocal expression. Can we do better service to our pupils than in the teaching of these elements? Quality subdivides into its varieties or kinds, and we have normal, orotund, oral, aspirate, guttural, pectoral, nasal and falsetto qualities, all of which are distinctly heard in the sounds of animate nature,—in the voices of men, women and children, the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and in all the sound vibrations produced by the forces about us. Furthermore, they are the natural expression of all the various shadings of thought and emotion of which the human mind is capable. The correct and effective giving forth to others the exact meaning or impression that the speaker intends is indicated by the right use of these elements; and in like manner the exact fault or defect in the speaker is marked by the wrong use of these elements. By a skillful mastery of these elements and a sure technical use of them, the speaker can scarcely fail to use them correctly and unconsciously in the practical art of expression. So with all the other elements which we choose to call by time-honored names, though a recent writer of our profession has given them new and strange names, and has made a barefaced claim to originality. Let us call a spade a spade.

Any attempt to explain this philosophy would make too great a demand upon the time of our session, which is not at my command, and to most of you it would be an old and familiar story. I am talking to elocutionists who are not ashamed of the name. But perhaps some doubting Thomas will say that the knowledge and use of these elements will make a speaker mechanical. Did the technique of piano practice and the knowledge of harmonies of sound make any of the great masters of music mechanical? It is well to insist upon the requisite imagination and feeling, but what sane teacher would even drill his pupils on these elements without impressing a full realization of the thought and emotion back of them? It is all very well for the idealist to philosophize on how many angels can dance on the point of a needle at one and the same time, but when we honestly seek to know the truth about

expression, I tell you, my friends, we must have a consistent body of definite knowledge based upon the solid bed-rock of facts. (Applause.)

I should like to have an hour, as Dr. Neff had, to lay before you this system, and to explain more fully my reference to it as a philosophy of life. That is a large subject, and a very attractive one, which I dare not now attempt to treat. If anything I have said shall find lodgment, or evoke discussion on your part, I shall feel fortunate. I thank you for your attention.

MISS LAUGHTON: The remarks of Mr. Fulton are now open for discussion.

DR. NEFF: I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything more, but, lest there might be a misunderstanding,—it seems that I was not entirely understood by my friend, Professor Fulton, and it is no fault of Professor Fulton's, but my own inability to think clearly; I am unable to express what I think, and unable to think clearly, to make what I say clear to other people.

Now, I want to take about two minutes, and I trust you will tap on the table at the end of that time, because I may speak too long. We say that if we have the thought we can express it. Now, I do not wish to contradict what Professor Fulton said, and I hope he will correct me if I do. We all agree about finding out what is true. We know that there is an eternal, divine, God-originated science in connection with this thing. Everything in this world is scientific, and it is our business to discover the science. There is no such thing as a man-made science. Man only discovers science, and they have all been created; all sciences are somewhere.

I am perfectly well aware that in the short time of one hour it was absolutely impossible for me, in my present state of mental development, to put the proposition that I have talked about clearly before you. I had only about three-quarters of an hour to prepare my thought, and so I have been misunderstood. But there is one thing about which I hope you do not misunderstand me. The point is this. We talk about having the thought; we talk about the conditions of the mind; and Professor Fulton says that the mind may be all right, the thought may be all right, but even then the expression will not be all right; there will be something the matter with the expression. This is true under certain conditions. A man whose one vocal chord is shorter than another will never have perfect chords by thought power; never through mental inspiration. There are certain physical defects which can never be overcome, either by thought power or any other power. So, to say

that, if the thought is ideal the expression will be ideal would not be absolutely true, to put it that way. But this is what I think is true, that only through the volition of the thought and the development of the mind can we gain that degree of artistic expression of which any individual is capable. And no two individuals are capable of the same degree. It means so many things, both scientific and moral, a clear, concise method, a natural intuition, etc.; and we soon learn that, even after all that, the students do not all stand the same. Some are brilliant, clear to a great extent, and others are comparatively slow, dull; so I think that Professor Fulton does not realize, possibly, what I meant by the development of the mind; and when I say that after two years' work on that alone, with college graduates, and graduates of colleges and theological seminaries, and the same time given to girls fifteen years old, the college graduates, the graduates of theological seminaries will know just about as much as the fifteen-year-old girls, and no more.

MR. SOPER: I heartily endorse all that has been said by Brother Neff, and I endorse a great deal more beside. It has been my experience that we don't always express what we mean, even if we know what we want to say. For instance, I attended a church some years ago, and the minister, in giving out the notices for the week, said: "There will be the regular prayer meeting on Wednesday evening next, as usual. On that evening Mr.— has promised to lead the meeting for us, but if he does not come we will have a good time." Now, he knew what he wanted to say and meant to say, perhaps, but he did not say it, and he did not know he had made this mistake. To simply do away with all system of training, all science, art of every kind, the training of the higher principles of technique, and to stop here, it seems to me, is wrong. If you train a boy to swim he will swim all the better for the training, even though he might swim without the training. And so with this art; it seems to me it is impossible to reach the highest point without this training, this mechanical, technical training.

MISS AIMEE ABBOTT: I believe that both the technical elocution and Dr. Neff's also may be right, strange as it may seem. I think there are good things in both points of view. I was a Boston elocutionist some ten years ago, a technical elocutionist,—I use the word advisedly. I was trained by the best of Boston teachers, worked in the best technical colleges, and went forth from Boston as a pupil reader, and met with some success for four or five years. Then I made an effort to get on the professional stage. My first remark when I could get the ear of a manager was that I was an elocutionist. He said he did not want any elocutionists. So the

next time I practiced some deception, and said I was not an elocutionist, and I got an engagement. I concealed the fact that I was an elocutionist as if it were something to be ashamed of, as if I were "caught with the goods on," as it were. They said, "You are all right, little girl; we will make something of you." So, after all my learning of pieces, it took me two or three years to get away from an elocutionary training. I do believe that where a person has no particular thought, no particular emotion, there is no use in trying to become either an elocutionist or anything else. You know they tell the story about the man who had three sons; the first he said he would make a physician, the second a lawyer, but when he came to the third, who didn't know much of anything, he said: "We will make a preacher out of him." He thought that anybody could get up and preach, and didn't need to know anything. Now, it does need a great deal more courage and intelligence to stand before the public than to do anything else. While I heartily commend Dr. Neff in most of his ideas, I think the training is necessary to carry out those ideas.

MR. JOSEPHS: We all frequently say, either in approval or disapproval, if you have the right feeling and the right thought, the expression will be right. What do we mean by having the right thought? Having the sentential thought is not sufficient,—what the declaration is in a sentence; to be able to classify the emotional background of your utterance is not sufficient. We must have the present relation of the one who gives the utterance, and his apparatus. If he has the thought that he is giving something, then the expression of giving will be in his utterance, will be in his voice or manner, and if he emphasizes that, he will come to the point of giving, the gesture of giving. And I think that in our discussion of the technical side we overlooked this point. It seems, then, that when we claim that a mental attitude will produce a result, that means that we know what the feeling is, instead of feeling the emotional relations of the one who gives the utterance.

MR. FULTON: I do not wish Dr. Neff to feel that there is any conflict whatever between what he said and what I said. We were on the same ground, and I was emphasizing another side a little more.

I fully agree with him in the development of the mind. Mr. Soper sounded a safe note for us in this work. Miss Abbott added the last sound, a very helpful note.

Let me define elocution and oratory. The elocutionist is one who expresses the thought of another in a poem or recitation of some kind, in reading or reciting. The orator is one who composes

his thought and expresses it at the same time. So you see the elocutionist does only a part of the work of an orator, a public speaker.

What we all need to do is to branch out, get beyond the mere subject of elocution, and meet our work in that line, the training of the public speaker; then the educators will accept us. If we are developing young men and young women to become better speakers, and especially better members of society, then we are doing the work of which elocution is one subject merely. Let us branch out and be more than mere elocutionists.

I believe there is nothing particular to sum up in the work that has been done this morning. I appreciate what Mr. Josephs said about the work, and appreciate the attention you have all given me.

MISS LAUGHTON: We will now consider the hour closed. Mr. Hawn is to take charge of the nomination of the committees.

MR. HAWN: Please do not desert me. We have a very important function at present. It need not take us over ten minutes; that is, the election of a Nominating Committee, the duties of said committee being, of course, to select a list of officers for next year. The slate will depend, of course, entirely upon your selection of the members before this Nominating Committee. There are five members to be appointed, and that is always done from the floor, that all of you may have representation. I shall ask Mr. Silvernail to take charge of the election of a Nominating Committee.

Mr. Silvernail takes charge.

On motion, the following Nominating Committee was elected:

Montaville Flowers, Cincinnati, O.
John Rummell, Buffalo, N. Y.
Miss Decker, New York City.
P. M. Pearson, Swarthmore, Pa.
Miss Anna Warren Story, New York City.

MISS MARIE WARE LAUGHTON, CHAIRMAN.

THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1904.—12 to 1 P.M.

MISS LAUGHTON: The work on Methods of Teaching, as we have arranged it, will this morning be devoted to the Question Box, which Mr. Fulton will conduct.

MR. FULTON: Now, ladies and gentlemen, in order to get

through in just the right time, let us understand this. Each one is to answer the question assigned to him or her in two minutes.

Now, the first question is for Mr. Wetzel, who gave us such an admirable paper this morning:

"Why do not elocutionists see to it that the college student knows how to speak correctly before he goes to college?"

MR. WETZEL: I should say at the present time that it is owing to the fact that so very little attention is given to this subject by our preparatory teachers. I have talked several times with our preparatory teachers, and find that there is absolutely no attention, practically, given to this subject. Now, what are we going to do in such a case as that? I suppose we could have a special course prepared to be taken up in the course of study, which would teach the students to speak correctly, articulate correctly, in their everyday conversation. I suppose we could do something of that kind, have a course arranged; you can do this. I believe I will do something of that sort.

I should say that would answer the question at once, because it is utterly impossible to get the teachers of the preparatory schools interested in this thing at the present time, although they find time for a good many other subjects. (Applause.)

MR. FULTON: The next question is for Miss Aldrich to answer:

"Would it be possible for teachers under present conditions to insist upon correct English and good expression in ordinary recitations?"

MISS ALDRICH: The teachers who have studied this subject *do* insist upon that; but the trouble is in the normal schools and preparatory schools and colleges, where teachers are prepared for their work. In very few of our great colleges, and normal schools, and preparatory schools, is the spoken word dwelt upon. As Mr. Wetzel has just said, the trouble lies in the preparation of the teacher, not entirely with us, and not entirely with the colleges. If the teachers are properly prepared, they will do the work.

MR. FULTON: The next is for Madame Alberti to answer:

"What standard of speech would you suggest for Americans?"

MADAME ALBERTI: Is not our dictionary good enough?

MR. FULTON: Mr. Henley is asked to answer this question:

"What is the real mission of the elocutionist at present?"

MR. HENLEY: The real mission of the elocutionist, I suppose, would be to be heard, to enunciate properly, to enable their pupils to read distinctly.

MR. FULTON: Miss Wheeler: "What would your first lesson in elocution consist of?"

MISS WHEELER: It would depend upon the pupil. (Applause.) In many cases it is a lesson in grammar and rhetoric, a lesson in the rubric of a word, getting the sense of it, knowing a word, the meaning underlying the words in the sentence,—all that you teachers of English and rhetoric impart. In some cases it would be to get the voice placed upon the right place in breathing.

In any case the first lesson is a sort of experiment, until the teacher knows the temperament of the pupil.

Just where to get hold, and how, it would be impossible to answer definitely.

MR. FULTON: I will give another question for Madame Alberti to answer: "What is the difference between gesture and pantomime?"

MADAME ALBERTI: I think I stated this morning that I included gesture and pantomime under the same general head. It all means action, action in life.

MR. FULTON: I have here some questions that are asked without any names being given as to who should answer them. Any such questions will be open to any one in the Convention to answer.

"Is the term '*presonance*' not more comprehensive than '*resonance*,' in speaking of the slight sound which attends sub-vocal elements?"

MISS THOMPSON: I will answer that. I should like to have the question explained. (Repeating the question.) I confess I do not quite understand the question. Will not the writer explain it?

A MEMBER: The idea is this: There are certain elements in articulation which are made in exactly the same way. For instance, the letter "b"; the sound of that and the sound of the letter "p" are made in exactly the same way. Now, in making "p" there is no *resonance*, or "*presonance*"; but in "b" there is a slight buzzing sound. Now, my question is, should not "*presonance*" rather than "*resonance*" be used to express that vibration? If you close your lips tightly, you can hear a sound almost like the cooing of a pigeon.

MISS THOMPSON: I covered that yesterday by one of those rules. After the breath sound, you have that laryngial exercise. There is no science but practical science; science means work. The breath that is confined in the diaphragm in articulating the letter "p"—you have that breath held here (pointing to the diaphragm). You do not allow any breath to emit from the glottis, which would be this, if you did (illustrating). Hold your breath back, and give simply the percussion which results from the compressed air within

your mouth by the opening of the lips (illustrating). The same thing applies to sound. That covers your question.

A MEMBER: The speaker does not quite understand me. In making the letter "p" she does not say (illustrating, pronouncing "p" clearly); she says (illustrating, with breath only), and the sound, to my mind, as she says it, is a vowel consonant.

MISS THOMPSON: The speaker's ear needs cultivating. The distinction between the elements that I gave is this: Close your lips tightly. Listen closely. (Illustrating.) When I give the vowel, you can hear the consonant when the lip comes up. What you hear is percussion. That is called the glide system, because every sound that you hear which is neither a definite vowel nor a definite consonant is a glide. Therefore, what you heard was a breath glide (illustrating).

MR. FULTON: We shall have to take the next question now, as we are allowed only two minutes in the answering of each question.

Miss Laughton is asked to answer this question: "What should be the scholarship demanded for entrance into a school of oratory, where the pupil is seeking a diploma from that institution?"

MISS LAUGHTON: I should think that would depend entirely upon the school that you were to enter, the work to be done, the work you wish to accomplish. But, to my mind, nothing but a high school graduation should allow one to enter a school of elocution, a school of oratory, a school of expression—a college; and, if they could take that course before they enter the college, it would be better.

MR. FULTON: Another question not asked of any one in particular is: "Is it good form to preface remarks with 'I think' and 'It seems to me'?"

"I think"—"it seems to me"—that we will all agree to leave out those words. (Laughter and applause.)

The next question is asked of Miss Wheeler: "What do you consider the work of the elocutionist at the present time?"

MISS WHEELER: That question has been asked once this morning, has it not? Was not that same question answered by Madame Alberti? I do not wish to repeat. The question referred to the work of the elocutionist at the "present time." Perhaps the art of elocution has changed; perhaps the demands are a little different; perhaps we are beginning to realize the demands more. Please read the question once more.

The Chairman repeats the question.

MISS WHEELER: The real work of the elocutionist is the same as the work of all educators, to make a study of life, to make life better worth living, to live correctly, to enlarge our sympathies through the interpretation of literature, through the study of its beauties, through the culture of the body, of the mind, and of the soul.

MR. FULTON: I am going to ask two questions at once. I will ask Mrs. Chilton to answer this: "Why is it that elocutionists will tell you not to make a gesture here and there and at the same time make a gesture here and there?"

MADAME ALBERTI: "How do you get rid of unnecessary gestures in a talented pupil?"

MADAME ALBERTI: There are two things that I should try; first, to relax, to let go of one's personality; and the next, to give a reason why for each gesture. I think that would do away with a great many unnecessary gestures.

MR. FULTON: Will Mrs. Chilton answer her question now: "Why is it that elocutionists will tell you not to make a gesture here and there, and at the same time make a gesture here and there?"

MRS. CHILTON: Because she is a very poor teacher. I frequently tell a pupil not to make gestures here and there, and I try never to tell a pupil to make a gesture here and there. If I understand it aright, that is not the method that we have decided upon. I think it would be a very poor teacher who would give any such instruction as that.

MR. FULTON: I will ask Mr. Flowers to answer this question: "Which is the most practical way of handling large classes in colleges, or in schools to which many students come just because they must?" I suppose that means required studies in colleges.

I will now also ask the question of Dr. Neff: "I want a cure for self-consciousness; the fear of someone present who is superior, and may criticise."

DR. NEFF: I have felt a good deal of that self-consciousness in my younger days, and have been afraid of people whom I thought better than I; but I find, as I grow older, and have some ideas of my own, and have had some experience in expressing the best things I know and think, that I have reached the point where I am not so much afraid of people as I used to be. Do not allow your mind to become narrow; give it room for growing. I think if you dwell upon the things you hear about yourself, you are very liable to be self-conscious.

MR. FULTON: Now Mr. Flowers's question: "Which is the

most practical way of handling large classes in colleges, or in schools, to which many students come just because they must?"

MR. FLOWERS: In professional schools of oratory and elocution, the students do not come because they have to come; and, when you find indifferent classes in college, you must use some means to interest them in this work, if you wish to do them practical benefit. The faculty evidently have laid down the course of study, and if so, and they ask you to give a technical course first, you are obliged, as a good teacher, to give that course first. You may proceed by the methods of offering some interesting selection, and show them that you are working at something they have never had before, something entirely new and interesting to them. The first thing I should do would be to assure them I had something that they did not have, and which they ought to have, and make them think they ought to have it; encourage them to treat a subject better than they do, and make them interested in wanting to get what they have not. For this purpose, an interpretation, a reading, or something of that sort, would be the first thing, would it not?

MR. FULTON: I would like to ask Mr. Silvernail a question. Do you have required work in the Theological Seminary, that you are obliged to teach, or is all of your work elective?

MR. SILVERNAIL: All of the work in our Seminary is required. All of the men who come to the Rochester Theological Seminary are college graduates. Of course, they come to preach. Some work is laid down as class work, in uniform lectures, work done in class, for criticism by the instructor, and by the members of the class; but the larger bulk of the work is given in private instruction. The criticism on the faults of a man in reading or speaking can a great deal better be given in any private, individual instruction. I knew a man, with whom I had spent four years in college, who seemed to have made the work of that department very unpopular. The work was not more than half done; the department had run down. The students themselves went so far as to send in a petition that they might have some instruction. When I took charge of the department I wanted a foundation, something definite in the way of a basis for our work, a rational, philosophical basis. I made the men report to me, and I made each man feel that, in order to learn how to preach, it was indispensable to get up and stand straight and look like a preacher, to feel that you have a message to give to your fellow-men, and to know how to give it. The men said, "That man knows what he is talking about; he means business." Now the men will come to me

and ask whether they cannot have a chance for criticism. All of the work is required, but it is taken voluntarily.

MR. FULTON: This closes my part of the program. Let the chairman please come forward.

MISS LAUGHTON: In closing this Section, let me say that, in planning this work, the committee had in mind the Methods of Teaching, and we tried to give you the three sides of it: the development of the voice, the development of expression, and the development of pantomime; but, as I told you the other day, in place of the development of pantomime, we put this question box.

The rest remains with you, to tell us whether they should be given together,—taught together, or separately.

Now, in the Methods of Teaching, it had not occurred to me,—and I think it had not occurred to the rest,—that there might be a difference in teaching elocution, or expression, or whatever you choose to call it, to individuals, to classes and to colleges. Just the same as the work is diversified according to the pupil, you have to give it to the class; you have to give scientific elocution. Science is without partiality of prejudice. Now is it not so with elocution, or whatever you wish to call it? There is a certain unity of purpose through the whole thing. I do thoroughly believe that it is skilled workmen that we want, whether it be in the university, in the public schools, or wherever it be,—the man or woman who knows not only the subject, but how to impart it, how to offer to the pupil the thing that the pupil wants. It is within him, and to know one book we must know many books; to be able to teach one individual we must know how to teach a dozen. The work of public school teaching, to my mind, is one of the greatest things we have, the greatest privilege we have; and the work that is before every one of us is a dignified and splendid one; and the work with the child in the kindergarten is where we should begin, the work of speaking, of learning to speak well, to express one's self; and to express yourself you must have something in your mind. Everyone has something in himself, and by environment, education, teaching, we learn more and have more to express.

So it had not occurred to me to make that distinction. One last word. Elocution is a study that should be a philosophy. That is what we hope to bring about in our Methods of Teaching.

I thank you for your attention and courtesy.

MR. HAWN: I have one or two announcements to make. A word as to the Reports of this Convention. I have a letter here,—which I do not care to read out before you,—from a very prominent person in our work, who maintains that the best text books on this

art are the Reports published by this Convention. All of you who have not secured a full file of these Reports should secure them. They can be had of Mr. Trueblood.

Those who have not received Reports for several years past may do so, of course, if you have paid your arrears in dues. Two or three have asked me for last year's Report of the Denver Convention. I have not been able to send them, of course, they not having paid their dues.

To-morrow, under the discussion of "Business," the proposed amendment which I made at the Denver meeting last year will be laid before you, and I will outline its purpose. I want to prepare your minds for that question: "Active members who entail loss of membership by non-payment of dues shall not be re-instated nor re-elected to membership until after payment in full of all arrears. This ruling to be operative after the first meeting of the Board at the 1905 Convention."

I hope you will think carefully of this. The expenses of this Association are great, and the custom has been, very largely, that members have dropped all responsibility in the matter of dues until the Convention again met in the immediate neighborhood of the delegate's home. The consequence has been that our attendance, of course, is largely local, and the payment of our dues largely local. People will come in after ten years, and expect to be reinstated by paying \$3.00. I do not believe we can run this Association in a business-like way so long as this obtains. We will take this up before the Board of Directors this morning, and make some report upon it to-morrow.

(Adjourned.)

Section 11.—Interpretation.

MR. F. F. MACKAY, CHAIRMAN.

ASSEMBLY HALL, BOARD OF EDUCATION, NEW YORK
CITY, N. Y.

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1904.—9.00 A.M. TO 10.00 A.M.

The President called the convention to order, and announced that F. F. Mackay, of New York City, would preside during the ensuing hour as chairman of the Section of Interpretation.

MR. MACKAY: I think it is a pity that we miss so much of the practical work of the Association. I wish you would urge those who are really concerned, your students particularly, to attend these early morning sections at the hour in which we do most of our practical work. (Applause.)

MR. MACKAY: Ladies and gentlemen, the proposition this morning is upon interpretation, and the question, I believe, for you to consider, is with regard to the interpretation of the emotions, past and present.

You will find selections on the last page of the program, and it will be for you to read, for you to discuss; and, as chairman, I believe it is my business to see that each one here has a fair opportunity in discussion.

I think I may state one or two propositions to you, upon which we must act, and that is, all reading should be an imitation of extempore speaking. The reason why there is so much bad reading—and I think, perhaps, some of you have heard it from time to time—is because of a bad habit formed in early life, in the district school, or in the lower school rooms where children are taught that, if they pronounced correctly, the next great requisite for reading is rapid speaking. The question of what lies in the word seems to be of no consequence to the ordinary teacher of reading. I will not dignify them with the title of "elocutionist," because that is a very great honor. To be a great elocutionist is to be a very great orator, and to be a very great orator is to know the universe of things.

There is no art that includes more of the knowledge of human nature than does this art of elocution. I say "art." It is also a science. "Elocution" is a word that includes both art and science. It is a science in its arrangement and knowledge of human emotions. It is an art in the presentation of those human emotions, by the voice through the action of the vocal apparatus.

Voice is vocalized breath. Articulation is the result of the conjoint action of the vocal apparatus in forming and projecting the elementary sounds of a language. And if more attention were paid to articulation, pronunciation would be better heard in the lecture hall, the church, and the theatre.

Did it ever occur to any of you that, when you speak a word, it is nothing but a little chunk of hot air, and I do not mean to be disrespectful at all. It is a little chunk of hot air pumped up by the action of the abdominal and intercostal muscles against the vocal chords, where it is converted into sound, and by the action of the articulating organs shaped into a word, and you fire it out.

Now, upon the power of the intercostal and abdominal muscles to compress or condense the air in the lungs, will depend the intensity of the voice. So the air condensed in the lungs is fired out as a word on the same principle that you would fire a bullet from an air gun. And it is a remarkable thing that so little attention is paid to these first requisites; first, the breathing process, and then the articulating of the sounds.

Pronunciation we cannot all agree upon, because we have no standard. If you lived in France you would have a standard arranged once in every seven years, by a body of critics, and what the academy says is accepted, and what they say is not correct is not accepted. But here we have several dictionaries that are acceptable; and, if I say to you, "This is very *interesting*," and you reply, "Well, I think it very *interesting*." I say, "What is your authority?" You reply, "Webster." "Well, I studied Worcester." That settles the question. You have only to quote some dictionary which is acceptable, and you have a standard.

Now, I have said that all reading should be an imitation of extempore speaking. Do not, in your minds, belittle that word "imitation," by thinking that I mean you should imitate some teacher, or go to the theatre and imitate some bad actor, as seven out of every ten readers or elocutionists do; learn a recitation or two, and then hang out your shingle and teach. But, remember that imitation is the basic principle of all intellectual development. It begins with your first effort at a smile, and it terminates only

with your last effort re-presentation—the impression from your last environment, even when exhibited in death.

Yes, imitation is the active principle of all intellectual development, although it has been said that imitation produces hypocrites. Why, if that were true, the whole of society would be hypocrites. We all imitate one another.

But the imitation of extempore speaking means that we follow the mental drift, the mental intention, and the physical pictures that the extempore speaker makes, when following nature.

The orator stands always in the field of nature, and receives his impressions from environments unlimited. The actor and reader stand always in the field of art, and they speak always under impressions from a limited environment, namely, their author; although I think I have heard it contended in this body that a reader has a right to take the words of the author and put whatever construction he pleases upon them. In that case the reader becomes an author.

Every word in the language must present an idea, or something relative to an idea. What is an idea? It is a mental picture. What is your art? Your art is to make vocal pictures of those mental intentions. The actor has to make physical pictures of those mental intentions. The reader and reciter makes only vocal pictures. But it is the duty of the reader to re-present, as nearly as possible, the mental intention of the author, because if the author were here to read his composition to us, he would try to vocalize his thoughts. You that are here must try to vocalize his thoughts for him. No two persons read with the same quality of voice, the same enunciation, the same degree of force.

The great trouble with us is this, that we think we have a right simply to call words. Suppose I were to say, "Good morning, Mrs. Smith; how do you do this morning? I am very glad to see you." "Very well, I thank you, but mother is ill this morning." "Oh, is she? I am sorry to hear it, very sorry. Anything serious?" "No, she took a little cold this morning, but we think she will be all right in a few days."

Now put that down on paper, and say it in this way (repeating in a sing-song, monotonous tone of voice). That is what you do. Let us stop that sort of thing, and get down to the proposition that all reading should be an imitation of extempore speaking—and I do not care whether past or present—the man that is delivering it must see the author's intention at the time he wrote it, and must, in justice to the author, present the thought of the author.

Every sentence has a grammatical construction from which you

make a logical deduction, by which to know whether joy, or sorrow, or anger, or hatred is the sensation that prompted the author to the execution of the work, which is the sign of his mental condition; just as when you go into a graveyard and read on the tombstone, "John Brown, 1858," you know it is a sign. But if you want to know how John Brown looks now, you must dig him up. That is what you must do with those lines on the page. Dig down below the line, and see what is the cause of the existence of that line. You will find it the output of mental equilibrium, mental elation, or mental depression. Now, one of those three conditions of mind must have produced the sensation that you, as artists, are trying to portray; and you must find which of these conditions the writer or artist affected while projecting these words.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have occupied your time longer than I intended to. It is for you to do the work. You will find there on the last page, "The Tragedy." The story is simply a superficial tale until you come to the stanza next to the last one (reading):

"There she sat in her rustling silk,
And diamonds on her wrist;
And on her brow a gleaming thread of pearls
and amethyst.
'A cheat, a gilded grief,' I said,
And my eyes were filled with mist."

Let somebody read that, and show us how it should be read. Who is the volunteer? This is the best chance of your life for doing something. Who will read that stanza?

MR. ABBOTT read the stanza.

MR. MACKAY: Well, has anybody any question to make upon that reading? There is a chance for extempore speaking now. What do you suppose the motive is that prompts this man to reminisce at all? What is the mental condition; is it mental elation or depression? I should say mental depression. But when he comes to that passage, he has used a couple of words that mean something merely leading to mental depression, which is contempt. Undoubtedly he is expressing his contempt in those two words, "gilded grief;" and in the last line, he seems to have been overcome by a sense a little stronger than regret,—we might call it sadness. The sadness has produced a relaxed muscular condition. Mental depression it is that produces the relaxed muscular condition, and the result would be a hesitation along the line, as he speaks. Undoubtedly he could not help but feel it, and I think it

is out of the way to present that sort of thing in this way. (Illustrating in an unemotional, monotonous way.)

Well, perhaps you do not care about reading that. I would like somebody to talk about it. If you won't read it, talk about it. Talk about the reading I gave you just now. Miss Wheeler wants to say something.

MISS WHEELER: Mr. Chairman, I have only one point to make, and that is this: I respectfully submit that, in the usual way of reading this, there is too much definiteness; there is too much definiteness of fact, and not enough unity; not enough thought back of it. Do we want to say, "a gleaming thread of pearls and amethyst?" Is it not simply a crown of jewels, representing the power of wealth and of beauty, in the emotion? Is it not just "a gleaming thread of pearls and amethyst" (without emphasis)? Would it not be just the same if it were pearls and diamonds? And then, again, if I were telling you, should I say, "My eyes were filled with mist" (emphasizing "eyes")? Perhaps I should, but it seems to me now, that there is just one thought running all through the whole sentence; a unity of thought; and it seems to me I should say, "And my eyes were filled with mist" (without emphasis). (Applause.)

MR. MACKAY: That is very encouraging; do some more. That stanza does not seem to have attracted much attention, or aroused any great amount of feeling.

MISS FORSYTH: I would like to ask whether "a gilded grief" should have a motion of contempt.

MR. MACKAY: I am of the opinion that it should; I think the author intends that because he has applied the word "gilded"; true grief is not gilded. The application of the word "gilded," I think, is intended to express contempt for the grief.

A MEMBER: Would it not be "a cheat" (illustrating with motion of contempt); would you not give that expression to that word (reading):

"A cheat, a gilded grief," I said,
And my eyes were filled with mist."

(Reading last line slowly.)

MR. MACKAY: Why do you slow down on that last line? What is the cause of the slowing down, mental elation or mental depression?

A MEMBER: Mental depression.

MR. MACKAY: What effect would mental depression have upon the muscles?

A MEMBER: It would relax them.

MR. MACKAY: Yes.

A MEMBER: It is only a recollection of the grief, the past experience of somebody, and not in the mind at the present time, not a very great grief at the present time, merely a past grief; and it does not seem to me that much intensity of feeling should be injected into that last line, just the ordinary narration of facts.

MR. MACKAY: "My eyes were filled with mist." What does the author mean by that? I do not think he means the mist of the weather, the mist from the river—what does he mean by that?

A MEMBER: The poem means that, when he looked upon this picture, his eyes were filled with mist.

MR. MACKAY: He is talking figuratively, is he not?

A MEMBER: This happened some time ago, as I understand it, and he is talking about it now; and it seems to me that no such intensity of feeling should be injected into it. If something occurred to me when I was a child, and I were told about it now, I would not weep.

MR. MACKAY: That is a very extreme proposition. A man does not cry when he is reminded of his childhood; but go back five years, and tell me when you cried, and tell me the cause of your grief, and say whether the reminiscence does not produce an effect on you now. This man says his eyes were filled with mist. That is a figurative word representing tears. Now, if his eyes were filled with tears, there must have been quite a strong sensation, possibly a very nervous condition. The result would be a relaxed condition, undoubtedly; and the relaxed condition of the muscles would produce a slow motion of the organs of speech. It is so in nature, and so I think the slowing down of the line is very essential. As to its being merely a recital of facts, that line refers to the present. He has been talking of things that *were*, and now his eyes *are* filled with mist. I suppose that any of you can remember how in your reminiscences the feeling comes over you, and increases—as, for instance, you say, "Do you know Jennie Smith?" "Yes, I know her very well" (with a motion of dislike and contempt). "You speak as if you did not like Jennie." "But—well, you know she is peculiar. Why, do you know that two years ago, she came into the house and borrowed my best hat to go on an excursion; and last year she came again and borrowed my hat and parasol; and do you know that for the May-day party this year she actually asked me to lend her my new gown?" On such a reminiscence you will find your voice going higher in inflections, and increasing in force with an explosive utterance that expresses anger, although merely a reminiscence. That is what you do when you reminisce. (Laugh-

ter and applause.) Get right down to nature, and do not talk about theories.

MR. JOSEPHS: I have but a word to say. I have always understood that poetry is not a collection of facts—a statement of facts. If we read it as facts, we are not expressing, but quoting.

MR. ABBOTT: May I speak again? I want to go back again to the subject of our discussion of the interpretation. It seems to me that, as elocutionists, the point you have made in the remarks preceding the discussion—that the elocutionist must be an imitator—while it may be true (as a young man, of course, I defer to your greater experience), is wrong. Why did you take exception to my first rendering of this stanza, which was rendered simply to open a discussion?

MR. MACKAY: Then that was all right. I did not think that was your object in reading it as you did.

MR. ABBOTT: You see what the author intended from your standpoint; and I see, generally speaking, what the author intended, from my standpoint. If I am to be an imitator, and I regret to say that a great many of us are teaching our pupils to be imitators—it seems to me we ought to try to find out what you desire to express, and then express it as you did. We have not been doing that. Each one is giving his or her own individual idea of it. That, as I understand it, is not the way we get at the truth. Truth is universal, but the aspect of truth is very diverse. You see it from one side, I from another. I may see the truth from a different standpoint; for instance, the illustration you gave just a moment ago of reminiscence. With your nature, reminiscence is to you as you gave it, but should I stand up and reproduce *your* reminiscence when I am reminiscing? No, I think not. What is it makes art so beautiful to the artist? Not nature; I have seen that many times. But, if I said I saw that universally in every one, it seems to me art would become very monotonous. Each of us has his individuality, and it seems to me the work of the elocutionist is to express perfectly, artistically, gracefully, that individuality, through the words and the thought of the author in hand. Then we have a picture we can see, we have an individuality, and we have a unified whole, as Miss Wheeler has said. In striving for unity, we must not forget that there must also be diversity. In reading the stanza again, I should read it somewhat differently from what you have read it.

MR. MACKAY: The gentleman has evidently quite misunderstood my statement in regard to imitation. I thought I had made it clear when I said that imitation is as broad as nature. It

-is nature, and not the reader, the reciter, nor the actor, that you are to imitate. I took particular pains to say, people go to the theatre to imitate a bad actor, and imitate bad readers. That is the bad part of imitation. Through your knowledge of grammar, you are able to make a logical deduction of the sentence, and you say it is joy, or sorrow, or grief, which it represents. Now, your business is to go out to nature, and *study* joy, sorrow, grief, and imitate them. You do not go out into nature for your study. That is where all the trouble comes; you attempt to imitate each other. No honest teacher ever tells a pupil to imitate *him*—never! (Applause.) He teaches them certain facts with regard to the movements of nature, and says: "Go outside and study." I presented this proposition to this association ten years ago; that, when the teacher knows the technique of his art, his business is to go out into nature and study. I have been acting for over fifty years, and never have been accused of imitating anybody. I have the most thorough contempt for the actor who imitates another, for the reader who imitates another reader, because the manner is the individual property of that person, and no one has a right to take it away.

The individuality that assumes to represent all kinds of character by its own personality has achieved the very sublimity of egotism. The field of observation would be a very limited one, if the individual re-presented himself, because the individual is always himself, but nature is universal and unlimited. I have never yet met a man who had mastered and defined all of nature's forces, and must therefore believe that there is still an unlimited field for us to study in. What has been for others who have gone before is for us also. There is the field open, and the horizon line moves on as you move toward it. Live as long as you may, and study as earnestly as you will, you can never overtake that horizon in nature. Your field of study will never be limited, if you stand in the field of nature, and look forward. Pick up the facts as you go, and use them. Study joy, sorrow, hatred, anger.

Anger is always the sign of mental weakness. Anger produces a mental elation, a muscular tension. It elevates the voice and projects itself excitedly and rapidly. There is no dignity in it, no strength.

We assemble here, and listen to each other, to receive criticism upon our work, from each other. Criticise me just as much as you please, and perhaps you will find it an interesting exercise. But one thing I want to say: don't confine yourselves to any theory, unless that theory is based in nature. Do not talk about the melody of

speech in reading, nor of the harmony of gesture; for unless they express sensation or thought, they have no value in the art of reading.

MR. SILVERNAIL: I think Miss Wheeler's suggestion as to broad phrases might be given a larger, a wider application. I see that our topic is "Past Emotion as Present." Now it seems to me we have got to get a larger view of this particular phrase than any mere word study, any mere analysis of phrases. The relation of the personality of the speaker to the writer, of course, is an interesting topic. I might say—and not quite mean it—I do not care a rush about the man who *wrote* this poem now. These words lead me, with my imagination and perception, through certain experiences as I have been able to measure life. They lead me to feel, well, I am a man of the world, and I have had wide experiences. These are words of life. I seem to be very familiar with society; I study people to analyze them. I have a topic of great interest—human nature. I am very familiar with plays, having been to the theatre much. I seem to have lived some time, because memory goes back to distant days. I discuss all of these various elements. There is a larger perception; there is a depth of sympathy; a personal element, as a matter of personal feeling it seems to me, enters into it a good deal less than even our chairman seems to imply. He would simply remember the things and people responsible for that memory. Perhaps I could explain, if I would not take up too much time, by simply glancing through the poem. (Reading.)

" 'La Dame aux Camilias,' I think, was the play,
And the house was packed from pit to dome."

There is a certain surrounding that covers these words, a certain experience that brings observation of these external effects—those were the surroundings. It seems to me important, compared with what I wish to tell, where I came to a certain experience in feeling. "The house was packed from pit to dome"

"With the gallant and the gay
Who had come to see the tragedy
And while the hours away,"

as they do in Paris or New York. "There was the ruined spendthrift." This man was an observer of human nature, a man familiar with society, and a man who has seen the world.

"There was the ruined spendthrift,
And beauty in her prime;
There the grave historian, and

There the man of rhyme;
And the surly critic front to front,
To see the play of crime."

This is a general analysis of what he saw.

"There was the pompous ignorance,
And vice in flowers and lace,
Sir Cræsus and Sir Pendas,
And the music played apace."

All this is a mere description of what he saw, the people, the orchestra, etc.

"But of all that crowd I only saw
A single, single face."

Now he comes down to something personal, a bright memory passed on a wide observation, an experience. "But of all that crowd I only saw a single, single face."

MR. MACKAY: Will you tell us why you have read that differently from the other lines?

MR. SILVERNAIL: The other is not emotional; but now he comes to a thing that produces mental depression.

MR. MACKAY: And that produces slow movement, and a low range of voice.

MR. SILVERNAIL: Yes.

"That of a girl whom I had known in the summer long ago
When her breath was like the new-mown hay,
Or the sweetest flowers that blow;
When her heart was light, and her soul was white
As the winter's driven snow."

He tells about it, reminisces; there was something wonderfully attractive about the girl, as he had known her in his school days.

MR. MACKAY: You gave us a strenuous action of muscle on that line: "That of a girl whom I had known in the summer of long ago."

MR. SILVERNAIL: That was an early reminiscence of joy.

MR. MACKAY: Why did you do it?

MR. SILVERNAIL: I wanted to tell of her as I had seen—"summer girl."

MR. MACKAY: And the remembrance of a "summer girl" still makes a strenuous action? (Laughter.)

MR. SILVERNAIL: Yes.

"When her heart was light, and her soul as white
As the winter's driven snow."

There is a suggestion of joy there, light-heartedness.

"There she sat with her great brown eyes.
They wore a troubled look,
And I read the story of her life,
As 'twere an open book,
And I saw her soul, like a slimy thing,
In the bottom of a brook."

She looked as she used to look, but her eyes wore a troubled look.
There must have been something wrong about that girl.

"There she sat in her rustling silk,
And diamonds on her wrist,
And on her brow a gleaming thread of pearls
and amethyst.
'A cheat, a gilded grief,' I said,
And my eyes were filled with mist."

I do not believe there was so much contempt as our reader has implied. I think great grief enters there.

MR. MACKAY: Not there.

MR. SILVERNAIL: All through. I do not believe we need interpret that line in that way, with contempt.

MR. MACKAY: Ladies and gentlemen, I am very much obliged for your attention this morning. The Section stands adjourned.
Adjourned.

F. F. MACKAY, CHAIRMAN.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1904.—9.00 A.M. TO 10.00 A.M.

MR. MACKAY: I regret that Mrs. Davis, who was to talk to us this morning on the matter of inflection in interpretation, is detained by illness in her family; and so I will make a few remarks upon "Inflections." (Applause.)

I do not know what the lady who had charge of these remarks and work was to say to you; I have not the least idea. And, as I told you yesterday morning, I have nothing premeditated upon this subject of interpretation. It is one of my weaknesses that I am obliged to get up on a platform like this, and stand and think while I am talking; and so you will have to take whatever I say with whatever degree of allowance should be made for one who extemporizes and talks upon the instant.

I propose to take up the subject of inflection this morning, and I shall probably say a great many things that many of you may not agree with; but I would ask for a fair consideration of the subject from you, and that you may discuss it after I have finished with it.

You have all of you seen in books on the subject the term, "slide of the voice." I have always objected to the term "slide," just as I object to the term, "*new* elocution." I have always objected to that, because I believe it is simply an advertising dodge. Elocution is not new, because elocution is nothing but talk, and people have talked since long before the flood. And we had celebrated and remarkable elocutionists 500 years before Christ. For instance, Demosthenes, and 100 years B. C., Cicero. So that elocution is not new, and I look upon that term "new" as an advertisement; and I look upon the word "slide" as an advertisement, for I may ask you to answer candidly what does the word "slide" suggest to you, when you hear it. Does it not always suggest gliding on a smooth plane, or down hill? Does it ever suggest gliding up hill? I do not think any of you who have done sled riding down hill will recognize that "slide" means up hill.

And yet the voice moves upward as much as it moves downward, perhaps, although it most always moves downward to stop talking. I would say, therefore, that I will dismiss the word "slide," and talk about inflection, which is deflection. Let me dispose of another word—"pitch." Pitch is a technical term belonging exclusively to song. There is no pitch in speech. Pitch is any given point in a line of sound, up or down. You cannot speak a single word in the English language and maintain that point. You can pronounce the simple elementary sounds in monotone, but you cannot pronounce the compound elements without a variation in pitch; you cannot form a word without changing the action of the vocal organs in making the words, from a relaxed condition to a tension in conversation. And the consequence is that the sound wave is either compressed, and so elevated, or else spread out, and so relaxed.

Consequently, I say there is no such thing as pitch in speech, because pitch is a point of sound. If I sing "do" (illustrating by holding the voice), I can hold it at a point. But if I say "do" the voice is going up and down; so there can be no pitch, for, at the moment of genesis of the voice, song and speech separate, and they never meet again, until we find them coming together a little in what is called the median stress—a crescendo and diminuendo

movement of the voice, an element in expressions of love, friendship, and tenderness, and there song and speech meet.

I want to talk of inflection, not of pitch, not of slide, and I will give you the definition of inflection. Inflection, as a factor in vocal expression, is the movement of the voice up or down from the point of genesis. Now, if we attempt to illustrate that, we say up and down (illustrating on blackboard). You cannot tell which is up, and which is down, as they stand there. Therefore, when we want to illustrate it up and down, we make it (illustrating on blackboard). But I say it is the movement of the voice up or down from the point of genesis. Now, let us get at this fact, that all inflection is simply the result of muscular action. While I am talking to you now, you observe that there is a movement of hesitation, because I am hunting the words with which to express my thoughts, and while hunting, my voice is held up. There is a muscular tension holding it up, until I find the words I want, and when I find them, I let the muscular system relax; and that is downward inflection.

There are two inflections in the human voice, upward and downward. You might ask why two inflections; why not talk always in monotone? Well, there is no monotone in speech. There cannot be any monotone in speaking, because monotone belongs to song, the continuous holding of one tone to the point; in speech you cannot hold to that point. If I say something like this, "I am thy father's spirit, doomed for a certain time to walk the night, and for the day confined to fast in fires till the foul crimes committed in my days of nature are burnt and purged away," it sounds like monotone, and is put down in the book as monotone; but it is not monotone, but simply monotonous. Monotonous means like monotone, but if you listen carefully you will hear the voice moving up and down (illustrating). What makes it monotonous, then? The constant recurrence of the same mode of utterance, the same quality of voice, the same rate of movement, and the same degree of inflections. I have said there are two inflections. The degree of an inflection in speech will depend upon the strength of the sensation; for instance, as you sit there now under the effect of equilibrium, your voice might move slowly and evenly in talking; but, if moved by joy, or by anger, the voice goes away up, and the degree of the inflection will depend upon the strength of the sensation that has prompted the utterance.

I have said there are two inflections. Why not talk always with one inflection? The cause of the inflections is the tension or relaxation of the organs of speech. This must make two inflec-

tions. Muscular tension makes a rising inflection, and muscular relaxation makes a falling inflection. The body becomes an instrument for expressing impressions.

You recognize this fact, that, when the artist studies painting, for instance, he trains his hand and his wrist, in his endeavor to make exact lines and curves. If any of you are artists you know you who have had practice in drawing, can make stronger lines than one who has not studied, because the hand has been trained obedient to the eye, in doing it. So you recognize color, as well as form. The actor, or man who presents sensations, is simply obliged to train the whole body to respond to the mental intention. This is the difference between him and the artist—he trains his whole body to respond to the emotions, in time and movement. The pianist trains his fingers to respond to the time and movement of music. The actor trains his whole body to respond to the emotions of joy, anger, sorrow, hatred, or any phase of an emotion. His muscular tension will make the rising inflection, his muscular relaxation will make the falling inflection. A direct rising inflection is the language of mental simplicity and continuity of thought. In the circumflex inflections the rising and falling principle is just the same as in the direct inflections, but the circuitous movement of the voice in the circumflex inflections is the language of mental duplicity. And when I say mental duplicity, I do not mean in that disparaging sense of meanness, hypocrisy, but doubleness of mental action. For instance, in irony, scorn, sarcasm, contempt and doubt.

There is a compound circumflex inflection that appears in the voice that is the language of mockery. It is merely seeming to give, and yet withholding.

If I ask you a question, I give you the right to answer. The question should be made with a rising inflection, and you have the right to answer with a falling inflection. But if I put it in the form of a question, and give to it a double circumflex movement, you will say there is nothing that remains for you to answer.

Again, another proposition that is quite common, and I think it used to be laid down in the elocution books like this: "A direct question is one that can be answered by yes or no, and usually takes the rising inflection." Thus: "Are you going home?" (illustrating with rising inflection). "Yes." "When are you going home?" (with falling inflection). The question is made up of both the indicative and the imperative moods. The imperative mood always dominates the situation and takes a falling inflection, as in commands: "Shoulder arms." "Leave the room!" "Come back!" "Sit down!"

I might add to this a word about emphasis. I know that it is laid down in the old books that emphasis means the application of a superior degree of *force* to some word, or phrase, or utterance. Writers who write upon that subject always talk about putting the *force* upon a word. My definition of emphasis is: "Emphasis results from the application of any of the factors of expression, for the purpose of calling attention to a word, a phrase, or a sentence." Now, what are the factors of expression? Articulation, pronunciation, modes of utterance, qualities of voice, degrees of force, kinds of stress, inflections, time, pose and gesture. The rising inflection will not make emphasis, because it denotes a continuity of thought, and the mind does not pause upon the word on which it occurs. The falling inflection will add emphasis to any other factor that may be used. Suppose the factor is bad articulation. The word will stay in your mind because of bad articulation, which makes it emphatic. Suppose, for instance, you were talking with declamatory force, and change to whispering force. The words on which you make the change will be emphatic. Suppose you are talking at a rapid rate, then change to a slow time, the change in time would make the word or phrase to which it was applied emphatic. Thus, any of the factors of expression, if applied to the word, or phrase, or sentence, will emphasize it.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have been very patient, and I thank you. Perhaps I have given you something to discuss. I don't ask anybody to agree with me; I should not give two cents for anybody who would agree with somebody in everything. Listen to everybody; do not call anybody a humbug. Why? Because I do not know it all, and we haven't any right, I am sure, to call other people humbugs until we know it all ourselves. (Prolonged applause.)

Thank you very much.

DISCUSSION.

MR. MACKAY: Clever people can say a great deal in the few minutes allowed us for the discussion on this question. For instance, suppose somebody takes up the question of whether the movement of the voice up and down is a slide or an inflection. Suppose somebody else takes up the point that there is monotone in speech, and so on; take up these questions and discuss them. Go right ahead, ladies and gentlemen.

MISS NELKE: I think Mr. Mackay could not have intended to give us a rule that does not have a psychological rea-

son back of it. Is it not true that, if the mental action is right, the inflection is always right? Is it not true that, in nature, we all of us deliver our mental intentions correctly, provided always that the physical has been trained, or is in a healthful condition to do it?

MISS WHEELER: I am exceedingly glad to have that point brought out. That is our beautiful theory, that when the mental action is right the inflection is sure to be right.

MR. MACKAY: That is in nature.

MISS WHEELER: Yes; that is our theory. It ought to be so, but, as a matter of fact, it is not so in every case. We are not perfectly free agents, in one sense. We are hampered by all sorts of habits, effects of environment, temperament, by imitation. And, therefore, sometimes the mental action cannot get strength enough to influence the voice in the right way.

MR. MACKAY: We must have the physical conditions.

A MEMBER: Is it possible at all to come to any approximate decision as to the percentage of inflections that are incorrect on the part of the human beings whom we hear about us? As we meet men and women, many of whom have much of culture and education, what percentage in their mental conceptions and mental states are correct; what percentage, I ask, of their inflections are correct, —many men and women who never had one particle of professional training in the matter of vocal utterance?

MR. MACKAY: Well, that is a question that pertains to psychology, pure and simple; and we would have to study different groups of people to decide that question.

A MEMBER: When acting, are there inflections responding to that state of mind which they wish to express?

MR. MACKAY: That will depend upon the physical ability to express that sort of thing. The degree of the inflection will depend upon the strength of the sensation. If the body has not been trained to express strongly they may not express half of the mental intention with their inflection.

A MEMBER: I simply ask whether the inflection then must have been true to the particular state of mind and emotion which they wished to convey.

MR. MACKAY: The inflection should be an aid thereto; it should be correct to their mental intention.

A MEMBER: It seems to me that, while we must recognize a great deal of impression in the matter of public speech, yet in a great measure a part of the inflections which we hear about us are so true that there is very little contention as to the meaning of the people who are talking to us.

MR. MACKAY: There is one thing about inflection that it is absolutely necessary to consider, and that is that the direct rising inflection is the language of mental simplicity and continuity of thought; and wherever there is mental simplicity and continuity of thought, the rising inflection must prevail; that is the point to be remembered.

One of the reasons why people are chopping phrases in two is because there is no mental activity on their part, except to call dictionary words; and the result is that the muscular system is continually relaxing, and so making falling inflections; thus: "To be or not to be; that is the question." But a mental hunt for the next word to express the thought will produce a muscular tension that holds the voice up, and so you would say "To be or not to be"; (illustrating with rising inflection) "that is the question."

"To be, or not to be; that is the question.
Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
And by opposing, end them?" (Falling inflection.)

(Applause.)

There the voice is held up while the mind is hunting for words to express the thought. It is absolutely muscular tension.

A MEMBER: I might contend, from my own experience, that the work of a teacher is to undo the environments that have reached the child before we get him. We do not have them in a plastic condition; and I felt this morning, while Mr. Mackay was speaking, that, if he could have done as the Master did, he would have taken a little child and set him in our midst that we might have before us an example of the natural inflection, just described by our worthy chairman. The child will teach us the value and force of inflection. But then they pass out into the world and lose it or become spoiled by their environments, and the teacher must undo it and take them back to the very point from which they started, which is nature's.

MR. MACKAY: I thought I covered that proposition yesterday morning, when I said that all bad reading is the result of bad habits in your early school life. We are taught to call words as rapidly as possible, without any regard to the mental intention of the author.

F. F. MACKAY, CHAIRMAN.

THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1904.—9.00 to 10.00 A.M.

PANTOMIME IN INTERPRETATION.

MADAME ALBERTI.

MADAME ALBERTI: Friends, I am here this morning simply to open up a discussion on Pantomime, and I want you to join with me. I shall call upon several of you to talk to us about this selection—"The Royal Princess." I have taken this simply as a medium, to get some ideas upon interpretation, and I want to take it up as a whole, not in parts, and obtain your ideas in regard to how you would study pantomime, and how you teach it, perhaps. Of course that would come in the hour for Methods; but still we have to go through methods, I think, to interpret.

As pantomime and gesture are to-day used as nearly synonymous terms, when we speak of pantomime this morning, we shall mean facial expression, as well as movement of the body and arms. These cannot rightfully be separated in any emotional expression.

Pantomime is action; it is the expression of life. That which is dead does not express. Death is inaction, life is action; we express as we sit, as we stand, as we walk, as we talk, as we breathe.

Expression may be divided into the active and passive. In pantomime we have active expression, and in which for our art there are a few general principles, and these are to us what the primary colors are to the painter. These principles, mixed and blended, and reblended, make the beautiful shades of expression that are as varied as the waves of the sea.

We will take the selection on the program this morning, simply as a means to an end, and through this selection as a medium, we hope to obtain your best ideas for the study and interpretation of any other selection.

I do not believe in teaching any prescribed positions or actions (unless it is what I call "language pantomime") for any selection. In the study and practice of a selection, I must *study* so carefully, and *practice* so thoroughly, that I can, as nearly as it lies in my power, give truthfully the thought of the author. If I thoroughly understand the principles that underlie all pantomime, and my instrument is so trained that it is responsive to the truth as I see it, my pantomime will vary but little, in giving a selection many times; and yet there may be other times when I leave out certain gestures, or put in new ones, or vary the old ones, or give none.

I shall ask three or four of our members to give us their opinion on this point, in a few words, and then tell us their plan of study of the pantomime in this selection, "A Royal Princess." I ask Miss Fulton, Miss Nelke, Mr. Abbott and Miss Wheeler to take up the discussion on the points I have mentioned, perhaps. I will ask Miss Nelke to be the first to take the "Royal Princess," and give us her ideas of how she thinks this poem should be studied. And I shall ask any of you to discuss it after Miss Nelke has finished.

MISS NELKE: As Madame Alberti has asked me to open the discussion, I will do it; but I do not find any cause for discussion, and I think I should express my views on the subject of pantomime just as she has expressed hers. I am so much in sympathy with the little she has said that I feel there is not much more to say about the method of the interpretation of literature. But may I just state one or two thoughts that came to my mind? I want to make a protest against literal gesture in interpretation. We saw the frightful consequences one evening this week of an over-indulgence in literal gesture. In real life, when people indulge in literal gesture, they are unrefined. I think the effort to interpret should be true to life, in harmony with the text, and then that interpretation will be entirely different from our own. Have we not justification in rejecting it? Let us be kindly in our criticisms. I hope to be judged that way in what I say about the "Royal Princess." If you do not think it good logic, or good sense, please do not utterly reject it. In the approach to a poem like this, I think that when we have made a careful literary analysis of the poem, the pantomime is easy. Pantomime is hard to teach *as pantomime*. Set gestures are worthless. Take the "Royal Princess," for instance. In real life, the Royal Princess would make any number of gestures in thinking of her troubles; but when we are to present it before an audience, we reserve ourselves for a climax, we have to think of effect.

I should, in considering this poem, see what it is the speaker is thinking of. Would I make the gestures personal? No, I think not. I am Miss Nelke, rather an undignified person. But I am supposed to be the Royal Princess, and I must not let my personal lack of dignity come into my interpretation of the Royal Princess.

After considering the poem as a whole, I would in each stanza consider the dominating emotion. What do I feel? This Royal Princess is as regal as her environment, education, refinement, luxury, can make her. That is the impression we get from the beginning of the poem, of course. But that is only an incident, only on the surface. The real thing in the beginning of the poem is the

heart aching, the hungering to live, to enjoy the delights of life, of motherhood, of love, of friendship—all these are denied to her, on account of her princely birth. This should be the dominating tone of all the first part; the other thoughts are merely trivial incidents, descriptions. If called upon to illustrate, my gestures would be (illustrating):

"I, a Princess, king-descended, decked with jewels, gilded, drest,
Would rather be a peasant with her baby at her breast,
For all I shine so like the sun, and am purple like the west."

(Illustrating, bending toward the sun and toward the west.)

Royal Princesses are supposed to be beautiful, naturally, and you insult the intelligence of the audience by drawing attention to such minor details.

Also in the next stanza, the dominating emotion is not a boast about the guard; her whole life has been one of repression, and she is bitter against it (reading):

"Two and two my guards behind, two and two before,
Two and two on either hand, they guard me evermore;
Me, poor dove, that must not coo—eagle that must not soar."

She feels the repression that she labors under.

In the next:

"All my walls are lost in mirrors, whereupon I trace
Self to right hand, self to left hand, self in every place,
Self-same solitary figure, self-same seeking face."

This is not boasting at all. She was tired of her miserable "self-same seeking face," reflected in the mirrors about her (reading):

"Then I have an ivory chair high to sit upon,
Almost like my father's chair, which is an ivory throne;
There I sit uplift and upright, there I sit alone."

(Illustrating in pantomime.)

A MEMBER: While speaking about literal interpretation and suggested interpretation, I think the great trouble is that we do not realize that literal interpretation is required sometimes. But where only suggested interpretation is needed we put literal. We overdo it in our work, do we not, very often; and it struck me that we do not realize where it should be suggested, and where literal interpretation.

MADAME ALBERTI: To me this poem is the development of a soul, and should be studied first as a whole. I would divide it into

three parts, three progressive stages, and the pantomime must correspond to those stages.

The first part I would call selfish, and that requires selfish pantomime, a continual looking in, a going back upon what she wants, what she longs for. I would call this part selfish, with the keynote "alone," and without love, which strikes the deepest note in every woman's heart, but especially in the heart of this woman. The eye is turned inward, the gestures are forward. In the first part she names over all she has, but to no effect. In this part there are two places where the light begins to break through; then the gesture begins to vary:

First: "Once it came into my heart."

She is dazed by the thought.

Second: "Meantime I could have wept."

Sympathy is aroused. Through this first part there is just a glimmer of what is coming, after that which she longs for. The first glimmer comes in "Once it came into my heart."

Now just here, in speaking of selfish gesture, have you ever noticed in life the difference between the gestures of men and those of women? They are opposed to each other.

The first glimmer is "Once it came into my heart"; the second, "Meantime I could have wept." Sympathy is the keynote here.

The second division is a seeking and groping. Then the gestures would begin to go out; the pantomime would begin to grow out from self.

The third division is open, free, generous, big.

In the first part, her senses are dulled by trouble, and continually looking inward.

In the second part, they are alert; hearing, sight, all sensations begin to be alert. The sensation responds to her inward thought.

In the third part, the soul breaks through the flesh.

"A time went by, a week went by."

As I said, two glimmers of that came into the first, two glimmers of the awakening.

The third division, of course, gives out:

"Nay, this thing will I do, while my mother tarrieth."

Now, I would like you to discuss this general plan. I will call on Mr. Abbott.

MR. ABBOTT: Madam chairman and fellow-teachers: Before I say anything about the corrections, may I be permitted to say that in all my studies I distinguish between thought and feeling, in my criticisms. That is to say, when I take a selection, I distinguish

between thought and feeling, when I am contemplating or considering pantomime. I presume I need not ask you whether or not you believe it is impossible to express thought in pantomime. I am not able to express *thought* in pantomime; I endeavor to express *feeling*, or rather feeling is expressed in pantomime. I would like to offer that to your consideration, that idea.

Now, of course, in coming to the selection in hand, I heartily concur with all that has been said about the absolute freedom from gesture that should pervade this selection, especially the first parts of it. Unfortunately, unlike those who have spoken before me, I have not given the selection as careful study as I should like to give it, before I make a definite statement as to what I should use. When I consider reading from the interpretive standpoint—that is to say, when I take a selection up to study, I seek first the thought conveyed through the word-pictures. Then, after getting the thought, the feeling comes, is suggested. After I have carefully studied the words for the thought (in the study of thought, of course, will come some feeling), when I touch upon inflection and emphasis, when I come to pantomime, I focus my thought, to see what my feeling is as a student in nature. In spite of what Mr. Mackay says about imitating nature, it seems to me that, when we come to bring our art before the public, we have to think and act, and we cannot be absolutely natural, in the sense in which we use that term natural. The higher your ideal of art, the greater artist will you be; the greater teacher, the greater ethical and the greater moral teacher. Jesus Christ said: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added." I believe, if He were teaching expression, He would say: "Seek first your highest ideal of expression, and all these things that come up to that ideal will be added." (Applause.)

This thought in our heart and mind will help us, when we come to an analysis of a selection of this kind. As the Royal Princess is very deeply moved, she must object to see what she sees, and in the outcome, the climax, we find a strong, vigorous and warm nature asserts itself.

In the first place, in reading this selection, I, as those who have read it before me, would make no apparent action, that is with the arms, head, torso or legs, as action. Her whole feeling I should endeavor to express rather in poise—that may not be the correct word, "poise"—but rather in intense feeling.

MISS WHEELER: No doubt this is something that we are all thinking of, and it might not be hard to bring it out, about the last part of the selection being open, free, generous, as contrasted with

the first part; still we must not forget the influence of environment; we must not forget that, after years of repression—openness, freedom, generosity, would bear the marks of those years of repression. Am I not correct in this, Madame?

MISS NELKE: I have spoken before, but may I ask a question that might provoke discussion? Maybe somebody will answer it. The latter part of this poem has been a mooted question so long. I agree with what Miss Wheeler has said, to a certain extent; but I call the latter part of this poem, the awakening of a woman's soul, and that in her happiness, her elation at this awakening, this woman is in such a state of joy that she forgets the years of repression. At last, she is so joyful, ecstatic, that I believe the dull-est clod would respond to such emotion in his brain.

MISS WHEELER: Still the body will bear the marks of the years of repression, no matter if the soul is awakened, the body cannot change in one minute.

MADAME ALBERTI: After the general study of the whole, I take up the selection in parts, taking up the particular thoughts right through the selection in that way, but letting all the rest, pantomime, or gesture, follow in their place, as they come. That is, I have no particular set of gestures.

I want to see whether you agree with me in the definition of pantomime or gesture. I have what I call Illustrative Pantomime. This can be imitative or spontaneous, purely imitative, or spontaneous.

Next, Language Pantomime, and that is the pantomime which we must learn as a language. It is the language that is used by the deaf mutes, and by the Indians, the so-called savages; and the French study the language pantomime from childhood, because they think that it will assist in gesture work. We have had illustrations of the language pantomime in pupils that have been brought to us from France; and I have also had the pleasure of giving language pantomime before this convention at a previous meeting.

Then we have the Emotive Pantomime. This may include the first and second, but must be creative. I feel that we are all creative, or we would not be progressive. We imitate and imitate, but always with progress, or we would be going backward. Now, this evidence of progression, to my mind, is creation, because our souls are one with the Great Soul, and we can be creative. In my mind, there can be no advancement without creation.

In this creative pantomime, I begin with the movement of poise, along a parallel line. The psychologists call it attraction and repulsion. I prefer to use the terms toward and from, as in sympathy

and fear. Then we have the next, along the perpendicular line, which gives us the rise and fall of emotion, as in anger and despair. Then the elemental emotions, fear, anger and sympathy, and so on through the gamut, and then the gamut is divided and sub-divided, and then blended. Then we have another division that is a little higher up, which are called physical, intellectual and spiritual, and their many combinations.

And may I speak of the word "grace," used so many times here. To me it means so much; it means true expression. Now, grace may be straight lines, or it may be angles; it may be curved lines; it may be spiral lines, according to the emotion. (Applause.)

MISS WHEELER: Will you say, if you can in a moment, how you would apply language pantomime in a selection of this kind?

MADAME ALBERTI: I would not use it in a selection of this kind, not at all.

A MEMBER: Do you consider it possible to divorce force and feeling?

MADAME ALBERTI: No.

MR. MACKAY: I would like to say a word with regard to, first, the word "creative," which the last speaker has spoken of, because of a previous conversation on the subject. I hold that no man ever created anything. Two words in the English language limit and define the universe of things—"nature" and "art." Everything that man finds here on the face of the earth he calls nature. Everything he makes he calls art. Nature is created, art is made. What is it to create? It is to bring forth a visible, tangible something, from an invisible intangible nothing. No man ever created anything on the earth. The earth was created, and all things that on it are. What man does is to make. What is it to make? It is simply to rearrange things already created. Making of silk is simply a rearrangement of the cocoon; making of a house, the rearrangement of the timber of the forest, and so on. Look where you will around you, all the works of man are simply made, not created. Probably that man who comes nearest to creation is the dramatic author, because the dramatic author is constantly seeking to rearrange the human emotions in such juxtaposition that, when truthfully presented (which is not always the case) by the reader, the auditor sees how like a man, how like a woman it is. And therefore the dramatic author comes, perhaps, nearest to creation, of any artist that lives. The painter does nothing but rearrange color, form, etc.; the sculptor does not create, but rearranges and reproduces, or represents; he does not create, he reproduces. Creation never reproduces. Now the slightest analysis of art will show that, at its

highest, its most desirable, its best, its truest, it is false. Nature is always true; it cannot be false.

Now, having said that much in regard to the word creation, I simply want to say that my theory of pantomime has been this, that pantomime or action, from the feet to the top of the head—the face, the general body, the arms, the hands, the feet, are moved by the same force, the same psychological force that prompts us to project the thought, and, if you notice this morning, you see the speakers, every one, making gestures and pantomime, sometimes very appropriate, sometimes not. For instance, what necessity is there for a person to stand up there and say, “*I* believe this.” Am not *I* talking; is not the ego here? (Illustrating.) Perhaps you say this is too much ego, but that is a gesture common in the theatrical world, to stand up and say, “*I* live here” (illustrating with pantomime), but always, “*He* lives here” (illustrating), when he is around.

Now the pantomime that we saw this morning, in the former illustration, was continually doing this (illustrating with gestures); so certain actions and thoughts of the human body are projected under the same influence that makes words to express sensations. Here certainly are actions of the body. Very well. That we cannot study them all is as clear to the thinking mind as that we cannot enumerate the stars forever appearing in nature, and increasing in numbers. You can no more count the pantomime for us, with the sixty-four muscles subject to unlimited impressions, than you can count the stars. But there are certain things that you can learn. You know very well, if a man were standing at that door, and I put my hand up so (with palm toward the door—outward), he would not come in. But I have only to turn my hand around so (with palm turned in), and he would come in. That is the hand of rejection (with palm turned outward); that of invitation and supplication (with palm turned inward).

Some of you can remember that we had a great teacher here, who, talking about pantomime, said: “I hold that, while that gesture may be emphasized *by* the other hand, that gesture cannot be emphasized *with* the other hand. I call attention to this fact that, ‘first’ and ‘second’ cannot be emphasized with the other hand” (illustrating). I tell you thus, and thus, and thus; but now, that some gestures may be expressive, I want to call your attention to one point. For instance, it is said that gestures should not be angular, or made in straight lines, for the reason that a straight line suggests determination, but a circular line expresses

continuity of thought, therefore is always pleasing to the beholder. Any segment of a circle suggests continuity of thought.

MR. HAWN: We have until 11 o'clock to devote to discussion. I should prefer, of course, taking up the topics with the person who delivered the paper on hand this morning, and, with your permission, if there is anything to discuss upon the section work to which we have just listened from Madame Alberti, we will throw the subject open for discussion. Are there any questions relative to Madame Alberti's paper?

MR. ABBOTT: May I say I had hoped, by a statement that I made, to provoke discussion. I said (of course, I did not use that term), but I said, in effect, that I divorced thought and feeling. I thought possibly I would get you to talk about that statement. While it is true in one sense, I do not believe it is possible in the true sense. I do not see how I can have thought without some feeling, and I do not see how I can have feeling without some thought. There is a distinction, however, metaphysical rather than natural, as we students express it and consider it.

MR. HAWN: Will some one else not discuss the paper, or its contents?

MISS NELKE: I wonder whether you realize that we have not had five minutes time devoted to the subject of elocution in the colleges and universities. This paper, as it was presented, and the general discussion, are very interesting, but why have we not devoted any discussion to this subject of elocution in the colleges? Why not find out how many teachers there are here who are teaching elocution in colleges and universities, and let us hear from them as to the work required there. I would suggest it; shall I make a motion?

MR. HAWN: No, I think it is entirely at my discretion. If there is no further discussion on Madame Alberti's paper, it seems to be the idea to devote the remaining portion of this hour to work in the colleges. Of course, we ought to have a paper devoted to college work.

MISS ALDRICH: It seems to me, so far as I can recall, that, in the eleven or twelve years of the existence of this Association, but one full day has been devoted to the public school. There have been papers here and there throughout the history of the Association, upon this subject; but the only full day ever given to the public school was a day in the Philadelphia meeting, which was full of suggestions, of thought, and most beneficial to all who heard it, and there were many public school teachers who were present at that time, as many of you will remember. It was one of the most

inspiring conventions—in everything excepting the weather—that we have ever had.

We want to reach the public schools; we wish to make people realize and recognize that our work as a practical art has a place in every-day work, that it is good for the laborer as well as for the teacher, good for the salesman as well as for the teacher, that it is good for the physical as well as for the mental; that is our duty toward our pupils. In the convention this year, I am sorry to say, every moment up to this time, up to the papers of this morning—only one of which is promised us now—has been devoted to discussions and work along the line of the entertainment side of the question. The public do not care for that. What matters it how a poem is rendered, when we want our boys and girls to be able to read a newspaper article. How many of you can take up a magazine or newspaper from the stands, and stand up on a platform and read it so as to hold the attention and interest of a large audience, at sight, not something that has been carefully prepared, but something that you must read at an instant's notice? That is what the pupils are expected to be able to do. It is something that we ought to give immediate attention to. How many of you teachers of elocution, teachers of pieces, are able to stand up on your feet at a moment's notice, and make an extempore speech? How many of you are able to write and deliver a well-framed argumentative oration, one that would win your side in a debate, if you were put upon a debate? How many have that convincing, straight-forward, earnest manner that is necessary to the lawyer, to win a case? How many have the power to place before a committee, if you were called upon to do so, a report of the facts of your case; if any of you were called before the directors of your company, how many could do it, and do it in such a way as to impress your directors with the thing which you bring before them?

Those are the things which the public want. Those are the things which we have to bring before them. We cannot possibly do it by teaching pieces. We cannot possibly do it by teaching this dramatic art, great as it is. We give the dramatic art the highest place, perhaps, in this great field of elocution, but nevertheless, there is an art which is more practical, and that is the expression of one's self to others—(Applause)—the speaking out of what is within, this giving out of one's thoughts and ideas.

This question is very, very close to me. I have been teaching in the public schools all of my life, ever since I have been teaching at all. I have taught from the first year through the High School. I know just what the demands are. I know that this work can be

taught, and the pupil may have the right idea of it if every teacher of elocution will go home and make up his or her mind that he or she is going to present this to the educators of his or her own locality, in the right light, not in the light of entertainment, but in the light of a practical, every-day, straightforward subject. (Prolonged applause.)

MISS THOMPSON: As the last speaker said that all of the papers that had been given so far referred to entertainment, might I suggest that there was a paper given which referred to hard work, and which bore most definitely on the very points that are brought up this morning? Those remarks were almost a criticism on the delivery of that paper, because it was almost as though, either the speaker was not present during the reading of that paper, or was not listening—or could not hear. Now it seems to me that we have, from the very beginning of the convention until the present hour, denounced the work of entertainment. It has been universal on the part of everybody, and the technique of our work has been very much dwelt on. Anybody who will mark the visible speech system, and master the system, and the principles of elocution, will be very well prepared, indeed, to meet any of the educators of the public schools in the country; and almost any of us here—I do not believe there is any one in the room who has had a thorough education in this work, who cannot take a magazine article or a newspaper, and stand up and read it. Those are the elements of the profession, the very fundamentals; and it might be a very good idea to put that to the test, and, if we cannot do it, turn this into a training school. I thought we were here to discuss the methods employed, as they do in other conventions, the methods that are employed to obtain results.

I am not finding fault, but the very fundamentals of our profession are attacked here.

Suppose somebody takes a book, any kind of a book. And if there is anybody who cannot pronounce or phrase, we had better turn it right into a large yearly school of training. I think that would be a good idea, if that trouble exists.

MADAME ALBERTI: May I ask whether the lady is also speaking of newspaper reading? Is there no one who, after careful training, cannot read a newspaper article well? The bad grammar, bad phrasing, bad punctuation, carelessness in writing—everything of that kind, is not because of the person's training, but because of the bad literature.

MISS NELKE: I would like to know how many teachers of elocution devote any time to the pedagogy of reading matter. I think

nobody can coach a pupil unless they understand the whole pedagogy of the reading lessons. I would not want a friend of mine to go to a teacher who did not; they may turn that into account, and earn a good salary.

MR. CARR: I respect the general public, and I am not one of those who say they dislike elocution. I think that it should be educative. The dramatic part is well taken care of, but the educational part should receive more attention. I think there is one other thing that the elocutionists might do. They might establish a standard if they wish, but they must not feel that they can establish a standard within themselves, in their own country.

I agree with Miss Thompson entirely. I think there is an enormous improvement; but I have amused myself here in this convention, by making a list of the people who spoke, and I think there might be some way of interesting and entertaining, and also making the work more educational. There was one normal school in this country, formerly, where the elocution teacher had the respect of all the other teachers; she held her ground, and all the other teachers co-operated with her. Now this is not done in our public schools. The elocution teacher should be given a certain amount of time, and he should command the respect of all the other teachers, and he should command and receive the respect of all those under him whom he teaches.

(Adjourned.)

From the Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Directors.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors on June 30th, 1904, at 8 a.m., the question of the correction of by-laws in regard to the election of new members was brought up. Mrs. Carter moved, and was seconded by Mr. Hawn, that the Board authorize the editor of the Report to make the correction of the by-laws in regard to the election of new members to read: "New members shall be passed upon by the committee and elected by the Board of Directors."

At the meeting of the Board of Directors on Friday morning, July 1, at 8 a.m., Mr. Fulton moved, and was seconded by Mr. Dillenbeck, that the following be made an amendment to our Constitution and that it be recommended to the body for approval: "Active members who entail loss of membership by non-payment of dues shall not be re-instated nor re-elected to membership until after payment in full of all arrears. This ruling to be operative after the first meeting of the Board at the 1905 Convention." The motion was carried.

At the meeting of the Board of Directors on Friday morning, July 1st, at 8 a.m., it was moved by Mr. Mackay, and seconded by Mr. Hawn, that Paul M. Pearson's magazine, "Talent," be adopted as the Association's official organ. The motion was carried. Mr. Mackay moved, and was seconded by Mrs. Walton, that a committee of three be appointed to draw up a contract with Mr. Pearson. The motion carried. Mr. Fulton moved, and was seconded by Mrs. Walton, that Mr. Sargent, Mr. Mackay and Mr. Dillenbeck constitute that committee, which motion was also carried.

FRANCES CARTER, Secretary.

N. B.—The Amendment to the Constitution recommended by the Board of Directors was accepted by the vote of the members in the session of Friday morning.

BOARD OF EDUCATION BUILDING,
NEW YORK CITY, July 1st, 1904.

ORGANIZATION OF THE NEW BOARD.

The new Board met, with Mr. Hawn in the chair. The following members were present: Mr. Sargent, Mrs. Elizabeth R. Walton, Miss Miriam Nelke, Miss Powell, Mr. Mackay, Mr. Silvernail.

It was moved and carried that the report of the treasurer be referred to the Auditing Committee.

It was moved and carried that the name of the chairman of the Committee on Credentials be added to the list of names on the letterhead.

It was moved and carried that the president be requested to make out a schedule of the duties of the officers and the committees of the Association and put them in the form of by-laws for the next Convention.

The following committees were appointed:

WAYS AND MEANS.—Mrs. Elizabeth R. Walton, Chairman, 2005 G Street, Washington, D. C.; Henry Gaines Hawn, New York; Elizabeth M. Irving, Cincinnati, O.; Channing Rudd, Washington, D. C.; Miriam Nelke, Provo, Utah; John P. Silvernail, Rochester, N. Y.; Hannibal A. Williams, New York City.

LITERARY COMMITTEE.—Franklin H. Sargent, Chairman, Empire Theater Building, New York City; Laura E. Aldrich, Cincinnati, O.; Emma A. Greeley, Boston, Mass.; Adrian M. Newens, Ames, Ia.; Edward A. Ott, Chicago, Ill.; Thomas C. Trueblood, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Cora M. Wheeler, Utica, N. Y.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES.—F. F. Mackay, Chairman, Broadway Theater Building, New York City; E. M. Booth, Chicago, Ill.; Cora Marsland, Emporia, Kan.; V. A. Pinkley, Cincinnati, O.; Martea G. Powell, Denver, Col.; Harriet A. Prunk, Indianapolis, Ind.; John Rummell, Buffalo, N. Y.

Upon motion, Mr. John P. Silvernail, Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., was made chairman of the Committee on Credentials, and Mr. John Rummell, 101 Hamilton Street, Buffalo, N. Y., chairman Extension Committee.

Upon motion, the Board adjourned.

R. E. PATTISON KLINE, Secretary.

Meeting of the Board, Friday, July 1, 11 p.m.

Upon motion, the By-Law requiring the posting of names of applicants for membership for a period of twenty-four hours was suspended. The name of Mrs. Isabel Garghill Beecher was proposed and favorably voted upon.

It was moved and carried that the President be privileged to visit Washington at any time on business of the Association at the expense of that body.

Upon motion, the Board adjourned.

MIRIAM NELKE, Secretary pro tem.

TREASURER'S REPORT TO JULY 1, 1904.

Amount received from former treasurer	\$460.88
Amount collected for dues	544.84
	<hr/>
Total cash	\$1,005.72

EXPENSES TO JULY 1, 1904.

To Greenwich Press for printing annual report	\$269.98
To Miss Mary Paden, for stenographic work during Denver Convention	100.00
To mailing annual reports	31.86
To New York Convention programs	36.00
To total expenses of different officers for year ending July 1st, 1904	267.37
	<hr/>
Total expenses	\$705.21
Balance in treasury, July 1st, 1904	300.51

\$1,005.72

Respectfully submitted,

PRESTON K. DILLINBECK, Treasurer.

Above account audited and found correct.

ROBERT I. FULTON,	} Auditing Committee.
JOHN RUMMELL,	
MARTEA G. POWELL,	

List of Members

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Alger, Mr. William B., 6 Brimmer St., Boston, Mass.
Bell, Mr. A. Melville, 1525 Thirty-fifth St., W., Washington, D. C.
Russell, Rev. Francis T., Soldiers' Home P. O., Grand Rapids, Mich.

MEMBERS.

A.

Abbott, Mrs. Aimee, 221 West 22d St., New York City.
Abbott, Mr. Frederick, 249 West 55th St., New York City.
Adams, Mr. J. Q., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Agnes, Sister, St. Mary's Academy, Leavenworth, Kan.
Alberti, Madame Eva, Carnegie Hall, New York City.
Aldrich, Miss Laura E., 2393 Station D, Hanck Building, Walnut Hill, Cincinnati, O.
Allenbach, Miss A. J., East Orange, N. J.
Amblor, Miss Emma L., 74 Linden Ave., Middletown, N. Y.
Ayers, Mrs. Evelyn B., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

B.

Babcock, Miss Maud May, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Baker, Mrs. Bertha Kunz, 359 Orington Ave., Bay Ridge, New York City.
A. Baker, Miss Grace D., 1429 Detroit St., Denver, Col.
A. Baker, Miss Ida L., Franklin School, Spokane, Wash.
Babbitt, Mr. J. W., 24½ Bridge St., Newark, N. J.
A. Barns, Miss Ida A., 522 Howard Ave., New Haven, Conn.
Barrington, Miss M. Aurelia, 1114 F St., Washington, D. C.
Batterton, Miss Virginia P., 4431 S. Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.
Battis, Mr. Wm. Sterling, 6637 Normal Ave., Chicago, Ill.
A. Bauman, Miss Zola Consuelo, 1837 Grant Ave., Denver, Col.
Beecher, Isabel Garghill, Slayton Bureau, Chicago, Ill.
Bell, Miss Lelia Allene, Castleton-on-the-Hudson, N. Y.
A. Bentley, Miss Agnes, Maple St., Dalton, Mass.
A. Bickerdike, Miss Elizabeth J., 399 W. Roscoe St., Chicago, Ill.
Bingham, Miss Susan H., Valentine Ave., Fordham, N. Y.
Blackwell, Miss A. Irene, 4050 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Blood, Miss Mary A., Steinway Hall, Chicago, Ill.

"A" before a name indicates "Associate Membership."

- Bolt, Mrs. Mildred A., 1191 Jefferson Ave., Detroit, Mich.
 Booth, E. M., 471 Fullerton Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Brown, Miss Clara J., Carlton, Orleans Co., N. Y.
 Brown, Miss Anna W., Carlton, Orleans Co., N. Y.
 Brown, Miss Hallie Q., Homewood Cottage, Wilberforce, O.
 Brown, Mrs. Lillian, Balatha College, Chicago, Ill.
 Bryan, Mrs. Winifred Wade, 1365 S. 14th St., Denver, Col.
 Buell, Mrs. Dora Phelps, 2222 Irving St., Denver, Col.
 A. Burlingame, Miss Besse, 1259 York St., Denver, Col.
 Burns, Mrs. Edith, Carrollton, Ill.
 Burt, Miss Grace A., Erasmus Hall, Brooklyn, N. Y.

C.

- Calkins, Mrs. Amelia M., 119 W. 92d St., New York City, N. Y.
 Campbell, Mr. Lawrence, Equitable Bldg., George St., New South Wales, Australia.
 Catron, Mrs. E. M., Ponca City, Oklahoma Territory.
 Carter, Mrs. Frances, 117 W. 58th St., New York City.
 Chambers, Miss Anna M., Steinway Hall, Chicago, Ill.
 Chase, Mrs. Raymond S., 1010 Forest Ave., Emporia, Kan.
 A. Chamberlain, Miss Priscilla, Utica, N. Y.
 Chilton, Mrs. William Calvin, Oxford, Miss.
 Churchill, Mrs. Liska Stillman, 1301 Ogden St., Denver, Col.
 A. Clark, Mrs. Benjamin P., 538 Maple St., Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y.
 Clarke, Miss Grace Dalrymple, 284 Fairfield Ave., Bridgeport, Conn.
 Coe, Miss Elsie G., Playa, Wash.
 Cole, Miss Katherine D., Jacksonville, Ill.
 Colburn, Miss Bertha Louise, 112 W. 90th St., New York City.
 Compton, Miss Emilie, 3834 Homer Blvd., Denver, Col.
 Conner, Mrs. Elizabeth Marney, Manhattan Hotel, 42d St., New York City.
 A. Cooder, Rev. Charles L., Rahway, N. J.
 A. Cooper, Miss Leno Ellen, Holdrege, Neb.
 Cullen, Miss Katharine Wheeler, 6908 Commercial Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Cumnock, R. L., Evanston, Ill.

D.

- Davis, Mrs. Estelle H., 19 W. 44th St., New York City.
 Davis, Miss A. Elizabeth, Fort Edward, N. Y.
 A. Davis, William R., 5836 Drexel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Day, Mrs. Janet B., 101 S. 3d St., Janesville, Wis.
 Decker, Miss Alice C., 221 W. 44th St., New York City.
 DeNoyelles, Mrs. Alice B., 2026 7th Ave., New York City.
 Denig, Miss Eleanor H., 2257 S. Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Dillenbeck, Mr. Preston K., 1012 Walnut St., Kansas City, Mo.
 Dingwall, Miss Olive, 17 S. Lincoln Ave., Denver, Col.
 De Chantee, Sister Mary, Leavenworth, Kan.

E.

- Earley, Miss Marian Lee, Pennington, N. J.
Eaton, Mrs. Floye D., Denver, Col.
Edwards, Mrs. Mabel W., 21 "The Colonnade," Marion St. and Colfax Ave., Denver, Col.
Elwell, Miss Jean B., 31 E. Church St., Xenia, O.
A. Emery, Miss Blanche, 4050 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
A. Eppstein, Mrs. Idah T., 395 Broadway, New York City.
A. Evans, T. R., Le Sueur, Minn.

F.

- Fauntleroy, Miss Sallie Conrad, 1321 Riggs St., Washington, D. C.
Fish, Mrs. Anna Rogers, Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.
Flowers, Montaville, Norwood, Cincinnati, O.
A. Flowers, Mrs. Montaville, Norwood, Cincinnati, O.
A. Folsom, Miss Emma, 522 S. Joe St., South Bend, Ind.
Folsom, Miss Nadine, 522 S. Joe St., South Bend, Ind.
Frankel, Mrs. George A., 5236 McPherson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Frost, Miss Sarah Greenleaf, Staunton, Va.
Forsyth, Miss Louise, St. Helen's Hall, Portland, Ore.
Fulton, Robert I., Delaware, O.

G.

- Gielow, Mrs. Martha, Greenboro, Ala.
A. Gifford, Mrs. Genevieve, 907 Prospect Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
Gillespie, Mrs. Emma Wilson, 534 Morrison St., Portland, Ore.
Greely, Miss Emma Augusta, Thespian Hall, Boston, Mass.
Griffith, E. M., East Orange, N. J.

H.

- Hadley, Mrs. Emma Pritchard, Cor. Hathon and Arlington Sts., East Somerville, Mass.
A. Hare, Miss L. Eugenia, 37 Jewett Place, Utica, N. Y.
Hartley, Mrs. Elizabeth Lyman, 223 W. 104th St., New York City.
Haskell, Mrs. Fenetta Sargent, Cuba, Mo.
Hawn, Henry Gaines, Carnegie Hall, New York City.
Heath, Miss Lea M., 1024 Scranton St., Scranton, Pa.
Henderson, Miss Gertrude D., 6712 Parnell Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Henion, Mrs. Anne Imogen, Waterloo, N. Y.
Hook, Miss Sadie, Ames, Ia.
Humphrey, Albert S., Galesburg, Ill.
Hughes, John J., 752 Broad St., Newark, N. J.

I.

- Irving, Mrs. Elizabeth Mansfield, 1025 Grand Ave., Toledo, O.

J.

Jacobson, Mrs. Laura, 4392 Laclede Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Jewell, Miss Winona Reed, 309 W. 97th St., New York City.
Johnson, Mrs. Abbie Gebhard, 424 S. Burdick St., Kalamazoo,
Mich.
Jones, Miss Mary Miller, 1710 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Josephs, Lemuel B. C., 63 W. 97th St., New York City.
Judd, Mrs. Ida Benfey, 1 W. 87th St., New York City.

K.

- Karcher, Miss Harriett, 2422 Lafayette St., Denver, Col.
A. Karr, Miss Louise, 824 Carnegie Hall, New York City.
Kellogg, Miss Ruth Elsie, 310 S. 5th St., Missoula, Mont.
A. Kennedy, Mrs. Katherine Shannon, 82 W. McMillan St., Cincinnati, O.
Kidder, Miss Amanda, 780 Woodard Ave., Detroit, Mich.
Kline, R. E. Pattison, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kan.
Kissinger, Mrs. Isabella C., 6312 Monroe Ave., Chicago, Ill.

L.

Lash, Miss Bertha Beatrice, 311-313 Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Latham, Miss Azubah J., 430 W. 118th St., New York City.
Leach, Alfred E., Baker University, Baldwin, Kan.
Leland, Mrs. Marion, 14 W. 107th St., New York City.
Lemmon, Miss Helen Nell, Zionsville, Ind.
Le Row, Miss Caroline B., 696 Green Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Le Roy, Miss Dora Marian, Manchester, Ia.
Lewis, Mrs. Mane J., 409 E. 5th St., Cincinnati, O.
Lounsbery, Miss Daisy E., Randall, N. Y.
Ludlam, Henry W., 1326 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Ludlum, Mrs. Mary H., High School, 3903 W. Belle Place, St.
Louis, Mo.
Lyons, Mr. George, Jr., Nelson, Neb.
Lynn, Miss Victoria, Orient, Ia.

M.

- Mackay, F. F., 19 W. 44th St., New York City.
Macomber, Miss Esther Cynthia, 453 N. 3d St., San Jose, Cal.
Magly, Miss Alice May, 1948 Fairfax Ave., Cincinnati, O.
A. Maguire, Rev. Andrew J., 53 E. 87th St., New York City.
Mahan, Miss Permelia Curtis, Savannah, Mo.
Manning, Mrs. Mary Dennis, Hotel Wychmere, 61 E. 18th St.,
Chicago, Ill.
Marsland, Miss Cora, State Normal, Emporia, Kan.
Mark, Miss Arvilla J., 52 Davenport St., Detroit, Mich.

Martin, Mrs. Anna Delong, 1230 Amsterdam Ave., New York City.

Mary de Chantel, Sister, St. Mary's Academy, Leavenworth, Kan.

Mason, Mrs. Ella Norton, 3 South 12th St., Denver, Col.

Matthews, Mr. Ernest, Normal School, Hays, Kan.

Melville, Mrs. Belle Watson, 306 Chicago Ave., Oak Park, Ill.

Merrill, Miss Hattie C., Hinsdale, Ill.

A. Morison, Miss May F., 12 W. 92d St., New York City.

Morse, Mrs. Lily Hoffner Wood, 117 W. 58th St., New York City.

Mc.

McAnney, Mrs. Lulu Jones, 169 W. 81st St., New York City.

A. McCoy, Mrs. M. E. C., McLeansboro, Ill.

McClary, Miss Zue, 370 W. 116th St., New York City.

McCown, Mrs. J. M., 614 Union St., Emporia, Kan.

McQuesten, Miss Gertrude I., 160 St. Botolph St., Boston, Mass.

N.

Neff, Miss Mary S., 2519 Auburn Ave., Cincinnati, O.

Neff, Mr. Silas F., 238 W. Logan Square, Philadelphia, Pa.

Nelke, Miss Miriam, 44 West Center St., Provo, Utah.

Nettleton, Mrs. Daisy Beard, Nebraska Central College, Central City, Neb.

Newcomb, Mrs. Lillian B., 19 Atlantic Ave., Pawtuxet, R. I.

Newens, Adrian M., Iowa State College, Ames, Ia.

Nixon, Miss Nellie Gay, 716 West New York St., Indianapolis, Ind.

Noble, Mrs. Edna Chaffee, Chaffee Hall, 780 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich.

Noel, Miss J. Florence, Lexington, Mo.

Norris, Miss Frances C., Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kan.

O.

Obendorf, Mrs. Leonora, 179 Sixth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

O'Donnell, James F., The Criterion, 1142 Woodland Ave., Cleveland, O.

A. Ogilvie, Miss Jessie, 123 Linden St., Topeka, Kan.

Oldham, Miss Marie C., Lexington, Ky.

Ostrander, Miss Emma L., Oxford College, Oxford, O.

Ott, Edward Amherst, Fine Arts Bldg., Monroe and Franklin Ave., Chicago, Ill.

P.

Parson, Miss Cherrille W., 582 Throop Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Pearson, P. M., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Perry, Edward P., corner of Grand and Franklin Aves., St. Louis, Mo.

Phelps, Miss Caroline Berry, 1206 Highland Place, Emporia, Kan.

Phillips, Arthur Edward, 243 Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Phillips, Miss Luella, Van Dyke Studios, 56th St. and 8th Ave., New York City.

- A. Porter, Mr. L. E., York College, York, Neb.
- Powell, Miss Martea Gould, 521 Opera House, Denver, Col.
- Pratt, Miss Lois E., 2330 Logan Ave., Denver, Col.
- Presby, Mrs. Charlotte Culley, 78 W. 92d St., New York City.
- Prunk, Mrs. Harriett Augusta, 716 W. New York St., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Puffer, Mrs. Priscilla C., 118 Hayel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Purdy, Richard A., 252 W. 84th St., New York City.

R.

- Ramsdell, Miss Leila R., Newburgh, N. Y.
- Randolph, Miss Mabel J., 1212 Madison Ave., Toledo, O.
- Reed, Frank A., 387 Hubbard Ave., Detroit, Mich.
- Reed, Miss Helen Jean, Spartanburg, S. C.
- Ripont, Miss Adele, 15 Allen St., Buffalo, N. Y.
- Ridgeway, Miss Katharine, Redpath Bureau, Boston, Mass.
- Rivard, Adjutor, 7 Rue Hamel, Quebec, Canada.
- Rudd, Channing, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.
- Rummell, John, 101 Hamilton St., Buffalo, N. Y.

S.

- Sargent, Franklin H., Carnegie Hall, New York City.
- Saunderson, George W., Holyoke Block, Seattle, Wash.
- Saunderson, Mrs. Harriett Colburn, Holyoke Block, Seattle, Wash.
- Sayer, Miss Harriett M., 53 Vine St., Bridgeton, N. J.
- Schermer, Miss Frances M., 328 N. Washington St., Herkimer, N. Y.
- Schuster, Miss Helen Merci, 317-332 Pike Bldg., Cincinnati, O.
- Scott, John R., State University, Columbia, Mo.
- Shedd, Mrs. Louise Pitcher, 112 East St., Pittsfield, Mass.
- Shoemaker, Mrs. C. C., 923 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Shoemaker, Mrs. J. W., Temple Building, Broad and Cherry Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Silvernail, J. P., Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
- A. Simon, Miss Rubie A., 406 West Cherry St., Nevada, Mo.
- Smith, Mrs. Louise Humphrey, 637 Bush St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Smith, Mr. W. Palmer, Edinboro, Pa.
- Smith, Miss Laura Maude, 17 Triller Ave., Toronto, Canada.
- A. Smart, Miss Zella, Logan, Utah.
- Skelton, Miss Luella, Canastota, N. Y.
- Smyth, Mrs. Ella, 707 Pennsylvania Ave., East St. Louis, Mo.
- Sonn, Miss E. Marie, 71 Belleville Ave., Newark, N. J.
- Soper, Henry M., Steinway Hall, 17 Van Buren St., Chicago, Ill.
- A. Southwick, Mrs. F. Townsend, 156 W. 81st St., New York City.
- Spaulding, E. L., State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Col.
- Starkey, H. E., Jefferson, Ohio.
- Stockton, Mrs. Jessie D. A., 1435 S. Tremont St., Denver, Col.
- Stoll, Miss Flora, 237 Andrews St., Rochester, N. Y.
- Story, Miss Anna W., 117 West 58th St., New York City.
- Strong, William J. H., America Company, Rockford, Ill.
- A. Suess, Miss Anna D., 363 West 14th St., New York City.

T.

- Thompson, Miss Mary S., 23 W. 44th St., New York City.
 Thope, Mrs. E. J. E., Newton Centre, Mass.
 Throckmorton, B. Russell, 203 W. 14th St., New York City.
 Towne, Mr. Orwell Bradley, Topeka, Kan.
 A. Tracey, Mrs. Bertha Kruger, Boulder, Col.
 * Trueblood, Thomas C., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Trueblood, Mrs. Thomas C., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Turner, A. E., University Place, Neb.
 Turner, Mrs. Wm. D., Hotel Maryland, Pasadena, Cal.
 Tuttle, Miss Helen, Wastingonville, N. Y.

V.

- Van, Vlissingen, Mrs. Jean, Chicago Woman's Club, Chicago, Ill.
 Van Wagoner, Miss Rosetta, 416 W. 118th St., New York City.
 Vining, Mr. Irving E., 318 W. 57th St., New York City.

W.

- Wales, Mrs. Clara Vaughn, 2112 Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
 Walton, Mrs. Elizabeth R., 2005 G St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Warfield, Mrs. Charles A., 412 Ashland Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
 Washburn, Miss Alice, 106 Mason St., Milwaukee, Wis.
 A. Watson, Miss Arabella G., 1705 Wellington Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Welch, Miss Clara E., 403 21st Ave., Denver, Col.
 Wheeler, Miss Cora M., Conservatory of Music, Utica, N. Y.
 Whitmore, Mrs. Opal Le Baron, Tuscon, Ariz.
 Williams, Mr. Charles, 19 Pierce Bldg., Boston, Mass.
 Williams, Hannibal A., 98 Lexington Ave., New York City.
 Williams, Mrs. Hannibal A., 98 Lexington Ave., New York City.
 Willis, Miss Maude, Lock Haven, Pa.
 Withers, Miss Sylla E., 183 Cass St., Chicago, Ill.

Y.

- A. York, Miss Martha A., Brookfield, N. Y.
 Young, Mr. James, Players' Club, New York City.
 Young, Alfred, P. O. Box No. 211, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Z.

- Zachos, Miss M. Helena, 117 W. 58th St., New York City.